THE Lutheran Quarterly

me IX NOVEMBER, 1957 *Number 4*

Office of Publication, 18 Carlisle Street, Gettysburg, Pa. Entered at the Post Office at Gettysburg, Pa., as second-class matter under the act of March 3, 1879.

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly,* founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review,* founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly,* Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Printed by the Times and News Publishing Company, Gettysburg, Pa.

Manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor, books for review to the Book Editor, subscriptions to the Circulation Manager.

Subscription $2.75 a year in advance; single copies 75 cents.

Editor
THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor
A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

Book Editor
WARREN A. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

Circulation Manager
PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
GETTYSBURG, PA.

LUTHERAN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
PHILADELPHIA, PA.

AUGUSTANA THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ROCK ISLAND, ILL.

CAPITAL UNIVERSITY THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
COLUMBUS, OHIO

WARTBURG THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
DUBUQUE, IOWA

LUTHER THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
ST. PAUL, MINN.

AUGSBURG SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

CENTRAL SEMINARY
FREMONT, NEB.

CHICAGO LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MAYWOOD, ILL.

EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN SEMINARY OF CANADA
WATERLOO, ONT.

GRANDVIEW SEMINARY
DES MOINES, IOWA

HAMMA DIVINITY SCHOOL
SPRINGFIELD, OHIO

LUTHERAN SEMINARY
SASKATOON, SASK.

NORTHWESTERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
MINNEAPOLIS, MINN.

SOUTHERN LUTHERAN SEMINARY
COLUMBIA, S. C.

SUOMI SEMINARY
HANCOCK, MICH.

TRINITY SEMINARY
BLAIR, NEB.

PACIFIC LUTHERAN SEMINARY
BERKELEY, CALIF.

AIMS AND POLICY

I. *Aim:* The aim of this quarterly shall be to provide a forum (1) for the discussion of Christian faith and life on the basis of the Lutheran confession, (2) for the application of the principles of the Lutheran Church to the changing problems of religion and society, (3) for the fostering of world Lutheranism, and (4) for the promotion of understanding between Lutherans and other Christians.

II. *Policy:* The editors will welcome contributions that are likely to be helpful in the furtherance of the aims set forth above. It will be required of such contributions that they be frank and fair in their discussion of moot questions; that they be free from controversial animus; and that their contents be of real scholarly and practical value to the readers. Difference of opinion between contributors, or between a contributor and the editors, does not of itself exclude articles from publication since the editors do not hold themselves responsible for the opinions of contributors.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Volume IX NOVEMBER, 1957 Number 4

CONTENTS

FAITH AND MEDICINE AT WORK ..... *Raymond T. Stamm* 291

THE LUTHERAN CHURCH AND AMERICAN CULTURE ..... *Sydney E. Ahlstrom* 321

THE HIGH CHURCH MOVEMENT IN AMERICAN LUTHERANISM
David L. Scheidt 343

HOW EFFECTIVE IS OUR PUBLIC WORSHIP? ..... *William E. Hulme* 350

THE MERGER AND THE CONFESSIONS ..... *Herman A. Preus* 358

LIFE AND THOUGHT IN WORLD LUTHERANISM

New Study of Luther in Finland ..... *Jacob W. Heikkinen* 361

BOOK REVIEWS AND NOTICES

Wright, *Biblical Archaeology* (J. M. Myers) 363
Young, *Studies in Isaiah* (J. Stensvaag) 364
Köhler, *Hebrew Man: How He Looked, Lived, and Thought* (E. Mengers) 365
Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament* (J. P. Milton) 365
Filson, *Jesus Christ the Risen Lord* (J. Reumann) 366
Raven, *Christ and the Modern Opportunity* (S. Rand) 367
Poteat, *Jesus' Belief in Man* (O. A. Bremer) 368
Owen, *Body and Soul* (M. J. Heinecken) 368
Hazelton, *God's Way with Man* (H. H. Ditmanson) 370
Murray, *Natural Religion and Christian Theology* (H. H. Ditmanson) 371
Miegge, *The Virgin Mary* (A. C. M. Ahlén) 372
Spinka, ed., *Advocates of Reform from Wyclif to Erasmus* (E. T. Bachmann) 373
Hudson, *The Great Tradition of the American Churches* (E. T. Bachmann) 373
Woolf, tr., *Reformation Writings of Martin Luther, II* (I. Iversen) 375
Rouse & Neill, eds., *A History of the Ecumenical Movement* (E. T. Bachmann) 376
Grueningen, ed., *Toward a Christian Philosophy of Education* (S. A. Rand) 376
Davies, ed., *An Approach to Christian Education* (R. D. Heim) 378

INDEX TO VOLUME IX ii

CONTRIBUTORS

Raymond T. Stamm, professor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, is on leave from his teaching duties on account of a long illness.

Sydney E. Ahlstrom, assistant professor of American History and Modern Church History in Yale University, is a layman of the Augustana Church.

David L. Scheidt is pastor of Immanuel Church (ULC) in Philadelphia.

William E. Hulme is professor of Pastoral Theology in Wartburg Theological Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa.

Herman A. Preus is professor of Symbolics in Luther Theological Seminary, St. Paul.

Jacob W. Heikkinen is professor of the New Testament in the Lutheran Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.

Among the reviewers of books in this number ar Jacob M. Myers, professor of the Old Testament, Gettysburg Seminary; John Stensvaag, professor of the Old Testament in Augsburg Seminary, Minneapolis; Ethan Mengers, professor of the Old Testament in Trinity Seminary, Dubuque, Iowa; J. P. Milton, professor of the Old Testament in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; John Reumann, assistant professor of the New Testament in the Philadelphia Seminary; Sidney A. Rand, executive director of the Department of Education, ELC, in Minneapolis; Otto A. Bremer, pastor to Lutheran students in the University of California, Berkeley, Calif.; Martin J. Heinecken, professor of Systematic Theology in the Philadelphia Seminary; Harold H. Ditmanson, professor of Religion in St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn.; A. C. M. Ahlén, professor of Philosophy in Northwestern Seminary, Minneapolis; E. Theodore Bachmann, professor of Church History in the Pacific Seminary, Berkeley, Calif.; Iver Iversen, professor of Church History in Luther Seminary, St. Paul; Ralph D. Heim, professor of Christian Education in the Gettysburg Seminary.

Faith and Medicine at Work

By Raymond T. Stamm

"NEAR Life, Near Death, Near God" is the title of an article in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* for April 13, 1957. It tells how a surgeon with a pocket knife opened the chest cavity of a man who had collapsed suddenly while at work in the X-ray room of the Lutheran Deaconess Hospital in Chicago. The patient's heart had stopped, but after two and a half hours of massage and drugs the heartbeat returned to normal rhythm. "Throughout those crucial two and a half hours everyone within sight of the victim—fellow technicians, nurses, doctors—was praying, some audibly." One of the surgeons writes that "there appeared to be a happy combination of fortuitous circumstances and favorable coincidences and a vast amount of unselfish cooperative effort. . . . Actually, we never were sure throughout that we were completely alone in this thing. We knew we were getting some guidance." The writer does not call the case a miracle, and he pretends to no clinical insight or theory of the supernatural. "He simply relates an experience," says the *Journal.*

Such an experience of faith working through medicine while medicine is working through faith is not, and never has been, unique. Time was, however, when doctors writing for professional journals hesitated to discuss the function of religious faith in the science and practice of medicine. That attitude is now changing, and the purpose of the article in the *Journal* is to emphasize the significance of the change both for the medical profession and for the clergy. "Never before have so many Americans shown such a high degree of parallel interest in religion and medicine. . . . For every new medical advance that affects daily our lives, there is an international or local news event embodying a generally accepted moral interpretation." Today it is no longer unusual to hear religious faith expressed by physicians. "There is growing evidence that—in the free world, at least—the myth of the 'godless doctor' is dying fast," and the medical profession and the clergy are in closer accord than at any period in modern times. "In the field of mental health, particularly, enmities between theology

and psychotherapy are melting away as the men in white and the men in black join forces in mutual concern for the individual's psyche."

I. From Estrangement to Cooperation

Fear on the part of religious folk that God might be forgotten, plus fear on the part of medical scientists that recognition of religion as a factor in healing might bias their conclusions, has been the principal cause of this estrangement of religious faith from the science and practice of medicine which is now in process of reconciliation. A brief account of the reasons for it is necessary in order to clarify the respective roles of the doctor and the clergyman in the cooperative enterprise of psychosomatic medicine today.

The task of the physician would be relatively easy if he could treat his patient as a chemical retort in which all kinds of controllable reactions are going on. Likewise the work of the clergyman would be simplified if he could save men's souls for life in the world to come without concerning himself with their bodies and with the earthly environment in which they are living now. But the patient is a person, and not a machine that can be taken apart and repaired one piece at a time. The biblical conception of salvation includes the *whole* man, and his whole life both in this world and in the world to come.

In the beginning, religion and medicine were associated, the priests being the practitioners of both. As the *Journal* says, there was "little, if any, scientific method in the medicine practiced by the priests in ancient Egypt and Greece. Nor was there high caliber in the medical practice assumed largely by the clergy in colonial America. Yet the 'whole' patient was truly being treated in the light of limited knowledge of those times."

But many things conspire to obscure this basic fact of wholeness and to interrupt the original cooperation between religious faith and medical practice. Patients, impatient to get well, demand short-cuts and associate religious faith principally with instantaneous miracles, failing to realize that if God takes time and heals by physical laws the healing is still his act. Medical science, on the other hand, has always to keep searching for the physical, chemical, and mental reactions to which all methods of treatment must conform if they are to succeed. That takes time and patience, the very thing the sick and their families find most difficult. Sometimes, just as the treatment administered by the

physician is beginning to take effect, the patient becomes discouraged, loses confidence, and goes off to the faith-healer, who then gets the credit for a cure which actually is the result of what his doctor has begun.

Attracted by glowing reports of the successes and ignoring the failures of the faith-healers—which are not advertised—some people get the notion that faith with prayer and without medicine is the only God-pleasing way to be healed. This divorces religious faith from medicine and helps to foster the false impression that medical scientists are materialists who are trying to heal the body with God and the soul left out. The Bible, which was written by men who possessed only a fraction of the medical knowledge available today, is misused by treating it as sixty-six books of divine revelation that contain *all* of God's will for man's healing, and nothing but God's will, for all time to come. Sometimes loyalty to the Scriptures is even thought to require opposition to medical research and outright refusal of medical treatment; as if it were irreligious and faithless ever to ask *how* God heals, so that we may apply the answer we get in the laboratory to the prevention and cure of disease. The *Journal* cites two cases, one of a woman who needed a blood transfusion but whose father and two brothers refused permission for it because they said it violated the scriptural prohibition against 'eating blood'; the other of a six-day-old Rh-positive girl whose parents refused for the same reason, so that a judge had to take temporary custody of the baby and order the transfusion which saved her life.

Misguided religious scruples do damage enough when they are sincere, but they are many times more dangerous when faith-healers exploit them to undermine confidence in physicians in order to make business for themselves. Unable or unwilling to undergo six years of rigorous training in a medical school, these unscrupulous practitioners attract religious people by insinuating that doctors are materialistic scientists who ignore God. Extremists among them warn the sick to have nothing to do with physicians, and there are things in the Bible which they can misuse to cloak their fanaticism with respectability. Some of the biblical writers were suspicious of physicians, as was the chronicler who reported the sad case of king Asa: "In the thirty-ninth year of his reign Asa was diseased in his feet, and his disease became severe; yet even in his disease he did not seek the Lord, but sought help

from physicians. And Asa slept with his fathers, dying in the forty-first year of his reign" (II Chron. 16:12-14).

The chronicler's interpretation of the death of Asa illustrates the main reason for the aversion to physicians which we find in some passages in the Bible which have been exploited by quacks ever since. His God was a jealous God who would be offended if the sick person did not go to him directly and then give him the sole credit for the cure; and so he was convinced that if Asa had prayed to the Lord instead of going to the doctor he would have got well. What he failed to see was that the king would have done well to do both, and that his death was not necessarily in punishment for slighting his God, who may have had other reasons for terminating Asa's reign at this point, good king though he had been. In making his interpretation, the chronicler did not take into account the fact that, physician or no physician, there comes a time when every man, even a king, must die.

God as revealed in the Bible was not bound by what we call physical laws. In Is. 45:6-7 he says, "I am the Lord, and there is no other. I form light and create darkness, I make weal and create woe, I am the Lord who does all these things." He might heal directly by speaking the word or simply by willing the cure to take place; he might employ agents, sometimes angels to protect and heal men, sometimes Satan and demons to punish and make them sick; or again he might send human beings to prescribe physical remedies such as the prophet Isaiah's fig poultice on Hezekiah's boil (Is. 38:21). But whether God's agents were bodiless personal beings called angels or demons, or persons of flesh and blood such as prophets and priests, the issues of life and death, of sickness and health, always remained in his hands. Whenever a pious man got sick his first thought was not of germs and of physical causes, as it is with us today, but of the religious question, "Wherein have I sinned and offended my God?"

When sickness was considered as God's punishment for past sins or as his warning not to sin in the future, the remedy was repentance, propitiatory sacrifices, and amendment of life. From this point of view there was little if any incentive either to seek what we call the natural causes of disease or to try to formulate the biological laws to which we must conform in order to cure and prevent it. The stress was not on the investigation and control of the secondary causes of phenomena, but on the revelation and will of a personal God who is the primary

cause of all things, and on maintaining right relations with him by doing what was pleasing to him. Obedience to the revelation which God had given to Moses was expected to result in *shalom,* a Hebrew term which is translated "peace," but which includes total well-being of the whole man both in this world and in the next. This faith, never quenched, but growing brighter through all the vicissitudes of history, is the peculiar glory of the Hebrew contribution to the spiritual evolution of the human race.

But the strength of any world-view in one respect can become its weakness in another. In the course of time it was assumed that God had revealed in the Scriptures *all* that was necessary to know in order to achieve this wholeness of life. Inquiring more closely into the *why* of disease, asking just *how* God made people sick, then made them well again, and seeking *new* truth that did not stand revealed in the Book was regarded by many pious people as a presumptuous assertion of prideful human reason prying into matters which God had not seen fit to reveal; and pride, considered as the worst of sins, brought the worst of diseases, such as leprosy, as its punishment.

The history of the interpretation and use of these biblical stories shows how often the miracles have been preached with demand either to accept them without question or to be branded as an unbeliever or as a person whose faith is too weak to avail for his salvation. Again and again, teachers of religion have made it appear irreligious, irreverent, or even blasphemous to ask questions concerning the faith. For those who make this devout but misguided approach to the Bible, the function of a scientist is not to frame new hypotheses required by new data but to confirm conceptions which have been fixed in advance on the basis of a supernatural revelation which is regarded as final and unchanging, despite the fact that many of the problems which the modern medical scientist is trying to solve were not within the purview of those who received the revelation.

Hampered by the resulting resistance to new explanations of the cause of disease and to new methods of treating it, many scientists concluded that the only way to maintain the freedom that was essential for their research was to keep God out of their laboratories. This did not mean that all, or even the majority of them, ceased to believe in God, but rather that they would not allow a theology that was based on a prescientific revelation to limit their research and bias their conclusions.

Meanwhile the world-view known as deism, according to which the Creator had wound up his universe as a watch to run by itself in accordance with the laws of nature which he had established for it, stood ready to justify a divorce of religious faith from the theory and practice of scientific medicine. This deistic way of thinking fostered a view which regarded miracles as violations of the laws of nature. The Creator became an absentee Deity who watched his spinning world from a distance, so that, when the machinery went wrong, he had to intervene by miracle to set things right. The consequent misconception of the relation between God and his world has produced an unhealthy hunger for miracles which fails to see that if God thunders by law, the thunder is still his voice, and that if he heals by a chain of complicated chemical reactions which is no less awesome than the lightning and the thunder, the healing is still his work.

The reaction of the scientists is understandable. The history of the relationship between faith and medicine shows what happens the moment religious faith yields to a superiority complex and declares its independence of the human reason. Faith then becomes credulity, fosters intellectual laziness, and pays the inevitable penalty by degenerating into magic. That is what happened in ancient Egypt, where the priests were the doctors, and where, after initial progress of great scientific promise, the medical practitioners found it easier to concoct magical incantations to drive out demons than to search for rational remedies for the prevention and cure of disease. While it would be going beyond finite human knowledge to say that bodiless personal beings called demons do not exist, history shows that real progress in medical science was impossible until belief in the demonic causation of disease, except in so far as the belief itself made people sick, was abandoned. Hair-raising incantations such as "Ablanathanablanamach-aramarachamarach" and the celebrated Ephesian "Askion kataskion lix tetrax damnameneus aision," which was said to have been the last word of King Croesus from his funeral pyre, might calm for a while those who imagined they were possessed by a demon; but the magical rigmarole was as likely to scare the exorcist himself as it was to frighten the devil. Even when it was successful it left the psychological and organic causes of the patient's derangement unexplored and untreated.

The people who wrote the Bible were thoroughly right in their

concern to keep God supreme in men's thinking as the Creator of all things and to keep his human creatures mindful that they are not God. But they had not arrived at the stage where they could see, as we do, the importance of investigating the physiological laws by which God operates to make people sick or to make them well. Modern research, on the other hand, in its justifiable concentration on the natural causes of disease, has sometimes become equally one-sided, leaving God in the background, if not indeed forgetting him altogether.

Now, this is the thing that worries sincere religious people most. They do not want to see God displaced by "Nature" spelled with a capital N and treated as an "it" which is subject to man's control in the laboratory. They are concerned to keep man in his place as a creature who is utterly dependent on his Creator for every breath he draws. Their God can not be manipulated, and he is not at our "command" as a healing force. The essence of modern materialism is failure to see this point. Materialism does not consist in the production and enjoyment of material goods but in the self-centered getting and using them without regard to the God who is their source.

These considerations explain but do not excuse the indiscriminate denunciation of modern science as "materialistic" in so many sermons today. The tragedy of this misunderstanding is all the greater because it has sprung from fallacious reasoning which pits loyalty to the Bible against science and insists that one must choose either one or the other. Fortunately, however, more and more of the pioneers of spiritual living in our modern world believe that the Creator wants his creatures to ask every conceivable question about the *how* and the *why* of his creation, and that such research is not incompatible with faith but is a mark of deepest reverence and truest trust in God. Spokesmen for religion, taught by the hard lessons of current history, now see more clearly the futility and the evil consequences of trying to save men's souls *from* instead of *with* their bodies and their environment. The philosophy and theology which regard the human body as the prison-house of an immortal soul have been weighed and found wanting, and theologians are recovering the original biblical insight that salvation and healing mean *wholeness* for human beings in all their aspects and relationships. And wholeness, precisely, is the aim of psychosomatic medicine mid-point in the twentieth century.

To achieve wholeness, physicians are coming more and more to

see the need for what the *Journal of the American Medical Association* calls "a unified field theory" of faith and health. They recognize that "at times religion *is* medicine," and that at such times a doctor who has no faith can offer his patient nothing. As Dr. Harold G. Wolff, the Cornell neurologist, has put it, "hope, like faith and purpose in life, is medicinal." But if hope is to be anything more than a placebo, it must spring from a faith which dares to believe that a man's death does not end his existence as an individual person, that his life is everlasting in duration, and that it is his business to work with God to make it *worth* living forever. Any lesser life-purpose is inadequate, and a wrong purpose is poison to faith and hope. To be a real life-giving medicine, a man's aim in life must be inspired by hope and faith that the Creator will give his human creatures a life that will never end. Increasing mutual recognition on the part of both the doctors and the clergy of all these essentials for wholeness of living is now restoring the original partnership of religious faith and medical practice which began with the dawn of science, but which was broken for a time by a fallacious view of the nature and destiny of man.

II. The Function of the Clerical Partner

What we have said about this growing recognition of the moral and spiritual implications of medical advance will have indicated some of the respective functions of the doctor and the clergyman in their common enterprise. More specifically, the business of the clergyman is to deal with man's burdened conscience, to inspire him with faith in God's eternal purpose for his life, and when he is sick to help him to pray for himself. In the pursuit of his task, the pastoral counselor has especially to do with the complicating factor of sin.

Time and again, the medical diagnostician must agree with Lady Macbeth's doctor: "More needs she the divine than the physician." Ever since the dawn of the human conscience, disease and death have been attributed to sin, not only to willful sin against God and fellow men, but even to sins of inadvertence and of ignorance. In the Bible, this association of sin with physical suffering and death is based on a covenantal relation between God and his people. Those who accepted God's covenant and faithfully fulfilled their side of it expected good health, long life, prosperity, and numerous and happy posterity. But if any one broke the covenant his doom was supposed to be sickness, sorrow, loss,

and death before he had lived out half his days; his children down to the third and fourth generation would share his calamity, and in the end his very name would rot. "The sting of death is sin," says Paul, "and the power of sin is the law" (1 Cor. 15:56).

As in the proverb, "Where there is smoke there is fire," it was assumed that wherever there was suffering some sin must have been committed. From the Scriptures one could learn not only what punishment would follow a given offense, but conversely might infer for each disease what particular law the sick man had broken. For example, if a patient had dropsy the inference might be that he was guilty of sexual sin; if he had quinsy, that he had slandered some one; and if he was suffering from jaundice, that he was being punished for hating others without justifiable cause. Measure for measure was the rule, and the worse the disease, the greater the sin was supposed to have been.

More tormenting than leprosy to the *im*patience of Job as he sat on the ash heap of his former prosperity was the ancestral dogmatism of his friends, who were quite sure that so vast a calamity meant that he must have committed some heinous sin. It was in the spirit of these cruel "comforters" that a chaplain came into a ward of surgical convalescents at the base hospital in Camp Meade one Sunday in 1918 and began his sermon with "Men, the reason why every one of you is lying here flat on his back today is sin." Like Job's friends, he was simply accepting and repeating uncritically the theology which his teachers had taught him. He had forgotten Jesus' rebuke to certain self-appointed judges of others who thought that those Galileans whose blood Pilate had mingled with their sacrifices and those eighteen persons who had been killed in the fall of the tower in Siloam must have been especially wicked. Jesus asked them whether they thought that these unfortunates had been worse sinners than all the other dwellers in Galilee and in Jerusalem; and reminding them that they were sinners too, he warned them to repent lest they "all likewise perish" (Luke 13:1-5). If the chaplain had taken Jesus' attitude, he would have been spared the embarrassment to his theology which arose from the fact that there was many a civilian safe at home who was as bad or even worse than these soldiers who happened to be victims of appendicitis and hernia, and that many a greater sinner was not sick but healthy, happy, and prosperous even down to old age. Also if the chaplain had taken account of the fact that sickness and suffering and death existed as

part of the life cycle untold millions of years before the dawn of man's conscience ever made him conscious of being a sinner, his sermon might not have lacked the compassion which is the primary requisite for any one who aspires to help the sick.

The chaplain's approach was determined by the idea that all sickness is the result of sin, and that consequently the first step in getting a patient well must be to lead him to repent and be "born again" in order to escape everlasting torment in hell. Another example of this approach was a service conducted one Christmas Eve in a hospital for tuberculous patients. Ostensibly for the singing of carols, it became the occasion for the distribution of a tract entitled, "Where will you be five minutes after you die?" and for a lengthy harangue on the fate of all who were not "born again" according to the prescription of the preacher. The man was sincere, and he meant well; but his theological ideas and his technique in proclaiming them could stir up far more trouble, especially for the mentally ill, than his sermon was able to cure. There are occasions when such preachers have to be denied access to the patients.

What has just been said does not imply that a pastor may sidestep his obligation to deal with the burdened conscience of the sick, but it does mean that approaching the patient by way of the wrath instead of the love of God is not only wrong in principle but may do much more harm than good. Preaching like this may have two opposite effects, one an aggravation of the sick man's fears beyond the preacher's power to allay them, the other a narcosis of self-complacency which is the besetting temptation of all who claim to have been born of the Spirit as God's chosen people, who alone are destined to be saved. In the present case the preacher, having distributed his tract, and having warned his hearers of the fatal consequences of their spiritual malady if they did not follow his prescription, went his way without telling them *how* they could be "born again"; all he said was that they must repent, accept Christ, be baptized, and be born of water and the Spirit in a mysterious conversion experience such as he had had. Neither he nor his tract gave any specific help in the psychological and moral changes which that experience might involve for *them,* each in his own environment from which he had come and to which he would have to return when he was ready to leave the sanatorium.

The experience of regeneration spoken of in the New Testament

is often described ideally as a supernatural transformation of the natural man who is doomed to die into a spiritual man who is destined to live forever, and who does not sin because he has no desire to do so. Taken ideally, this ought to be true. Actually, however, the hard fact is that this experience does not automatically make a man perfect; if it did, a patient suffering remorse of conscience could be easily released from the tension which is caused by the difference between what he is and what he ought to be. But St. Paul, addressing a group in his church in Philippi who were complacently claiming to be perfect, disclaimed perfection for himself, and advised them to be likeminded in this respect; and the preacher who wrote the First Letter of John had to warn his churches that "if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us" (Phil. 3:12-16; I John 1:8). Any attempt to relieve the tension of a guilty conscience which, wittingly or unwittingly, leaves the impression that the perfection required by Jesus when he said, "You, therefore, must be perfect, as your heavenly Father is perfect" (Matt. 5:48), is going to be a supernatural gift that can be appropriated without effort on the part of the recipient is cruel self-deception.

An equally pernicious remedy for the tension of conscience is to pull the moral standard down to the level of the patient's fellow sinners, allowing him to blame his troubles on his parents and on his teachers for having expected too much of him, and comforting him with assurance that all other human beings are with him in the same boat of temptation, and are sinners, too, many of them as bad or worse than he is. This has been one of the sharpest issues between the clergy and those among the psychiatrists who have decried religion. From the religious point of view any method of healing that tries to relieve a patient from his burden of guilt by lowering his conception of what God requires of him is unacceptable. It is true that God does not demand of us what is humanly impossible, but it is also true that we need the challenge of an ideal that is far enough beyond the attainable to keep us growing spiritually and to save us from the arrested development caused by self-complacency and pride in our present achievements. Allowing the patient to be satisfied with being no worse than others is a deceptive tranquilizer which habituates him to life's second best and delays his fulfillment of the essential condition for spiritual

growth, which is to accept responsibility for his own actions instead of blaming his failures and troubles on others.

The real remedy for a troubled conscience is not to lower the ideal but to throw oneself unreservedly on the mercy of God, trusting him for forgiveness, and then to keep striving all the harder toward perfection. What is needed is a prescription which will give the sick man confidence that he can become what God wants him to be and at the same time will keep his conception of God's purpose for his life as high as Jesus put it.

There are thus two extremes of conscientiousness, one leading the patient to despair instead of trusting God to forgive him, the other leaving him self-satisfied and indifferent to fine moral distinctions. The problem is how to avoid both extremes without lowering the ideal set by Jesus or demanding a perfection that is impossible for man. Another solution, widely favored today, postpones the full achievement of the ideal until we get to heaven. The New Testament message of salvation is interpreted to mean that God, by some miraculous transformation, will then make us perfect; but that, meanwhile, here on earth, we are involved in moral situations which necessitate or even justify compromises that will bring Jesus' standard of perfection down to the level of the currently possible. We are told that, although the very best we can do is still tainted with sin, we ought to do it, not because what we can do can ever be altogether pleasing to God, but because he commands it, because it is his appointed way for us to show our love and gratitude for his love and mercy, and because it is the expression of the new nature of those who have been regenerated by the Holy Spirit.

This approach has the advantage of leaving the patient with no illusion that peace of mind is cheap enough to be had by repeating some autosuggestive formula which assures him that day by day in every way he is getting better and better, and it also reminds him that the religious experience of being "born again" is not an automatic, supernatural release from the tension between what he is and what he ought to be. At the same time, as a repentant sinner, he is assured of God's forgiveness and is thereby relieved from the burden of guilt for his sin, which is the sting of death, and of his fear of an unknown Hereafter, which lies always beneath the surface as a complicating factor both in physical and in mental disease.

But as a solution to the problem of keeping the ideal as high as Jesus set it, while at the same time freeing men from despair because of their failure to reach it, this type of preaching does not give the sick man adequate motivation to grapple with his most serious *immediate* difficulty. Its warning against pride and complacency is salutary; its insistence that man's salvation depends solely on God's love and mercy is correct; and its hope for eternal life, which is the goal of its faith, is valid. But when the patient leaves the hospital or his doctor's office he still has to face the fact that he must not presume on God's mercy by continuing to sin; and so the civil war that has been going on inside of him keeps on. Lame with his sin, just *how* can he walk the tight-rope which the preacher has stretched between due humility and deadening despair? That is the practical problem.

What is needed for victory in man's struggle with sin is the expulsive power of a purpose in life so high as to be not only adequate and worthy of a person who is going to live forever, but is at the same time also a purpose which he has to begin to work out in this present world. Instead of waiting for the perfect realization of his ideal self until God takes him into heaven, the patient must start to develop his heavenly character right now by working with God, who has made man partly responsible for his own evolution, to transform the noxious environment which has helped to make him sick. Only a faith that is inspired by hope and energized by love to achieve this high destiny is truly medicinal. But unfortunately much of the current theological thinking leaves us in the lurch when it comes to providing adequate motivation for the rest of the patient's life on earth. With respect to the longer future of the human social order it is pessimistic, not to say fatalistic, in rejecting the idea of progress. Too much preaching today leaves the impression that, in order to guard against the self-deception and complacency which would absolutize any particular stage of social evolution by calling it the kingdom of God, we have to say that God alone can and will bring his kingdom without the aid of men. To lift the patient out of his fears we require faith to believe that God wants us to help him perfect his unfinished world, and that he has given man a responsible part in his own evolution. The main business of the clergy in the cooperative enterprise of faith and medicine is therefore to visualize God's purpose for men and to inspire and help them to work to achieve it.

The conduct of St. Paul in the impending shipwreck which is described in Acts 27 is an example for all who are engaged in this healing enterprise. Believing that God had important work for him to do in Rome, he was confident that God would get him there and would preserve his life long enough for him to do it. But Paul's faith did not spring suddenly and miraculously from the depths of an emergency. Rather it was a power that had grown strong through daily exercise in countless other trials all through his life, as we see in the catalogue of his sufferings in II Cor. 11:21-33 and 12:7-10. Long before that wreck on the coast of Malta, he had discovered the secret of making creative use of his troubles. Accustomed to using disappointment as material for patience, danger as material for courage, and ill treatment as material for the love that never fails, he was able to pierce the darkness of that storm with faith and hope from above. He had learned life's hardest lesson—the lesson of creative suffering, which requires every man to bear the burdens of others in addition to bearing his own. As a result, Paul could say, "I consider the sufferings of this present time are not worth comparing with the glory that is to be revealed to us," and again, "We know that in everything God works for good with those who love him" (Rom. 8:18, 28). His faith was medicine at work for every member of that despairing crew, and for all his fellow passengers on the way to Rome.

The best preparation for such emergencies as surgery is thus to have practiced the presence of God by daily, habitual, life-long self-commitment to him. Then in crises one can feel instinctively the undergirding of the Almighty. Paul was just as near to God in fair weather as in foul, in life as in death. He said, "In him we live and move and have our being" (Acts 17:28). In the same spirit, long before Paul's day, one of the psalmists could sing, "When I awake, I am still with thee" (Ps. 139:18), while another, in the midst of mortal peril, could pray with all confidence, "Into thy hand I commit my spirit"; and these, according to Luke, were the last words of Jesus on the cross (Luke 23:46; Ps. 31:5).

"Gone to meet his God," heard frequently when someone has died, completely misrepresents man's actual situation in relation to God; for as a matter of fact, the deceased had been meeting his God every hour of every day all his life, even though he may or may not have chosen to recognize him. Mrs. Quickly's account of the death of

Sir John Falstaff in Shakespeare's *King Henry V* expresses an idea which is the main cause of spiritual inadequacy in face of the crises of life. In describing the death of the old roué she says, "So 'a cried out—God, God, God! three or four times: now I, to comfort him, bid him 'a should not think of God; I hoped there was no need to trouble himself with any such thoughts yet." Because of that tragic *yet,* many a patient approaches his crisis with little if any genuine religious experience to draw on, so that the best his spiritual counselor can do is to communicate what faith he can by praying and by exercising his own faith in the sick man's stead. Then when the patient recovers, the adviser must see to it that the lessons of faith to be learned from his experience are not lost on him. His problem is not only to help a sick man to pray for himself during the crisis, but also to see to it that his nascent faith keeps growing in proportion to the increasing demands that are bound to come with the passing years.

In teaching how to pray it is essential to keep in mind not only the scope of prayer but also the fundamental condition, "Thy will be done," which limits it. When Jesus, believing that "all things are possible with God" (Mark 10:27), says, "If you have faith as a grain of mustard seed, you will say to this mountain, 'Move hence to yonder place,' and it will move; and nothing will be impossible to you," and when he even goes so far as to say, "Whatever you ask in prayer, believe that you receive it, and you will" (Matt. 17:20; Mark 11:24), the scope of prayer and the power of faith seem limitless. So, too, when Paul, having committed himself to the care and keeping of his Lord, declares, "I can do all things in him who strengthens me" (Phil. 4:13). These sayings have often been torn from their respective contexts and exploited almost as magical formulas, as if by repeating them one could compel God either to grant one's desire or else be proved false to his word.

It is all too easy to ignore the two essential conditions which Jesus has attached to faith and prayer. The first is "Whenever you stand praying, forgive, if you have anything against anyone; so that your Father also who is in heaven may forgive you your trespasses" (Mark 11:25). The special importance of this condition when dealing with the sick is due to the fact that a patient's refusal to forgive a member of his family or some other person, and to ask forgiveness of

them, may constitute the most serious complication of his disease and be the very thing that blocks his recovery.

The second condition is "Thy will be done" (Matt. 5:10), which Jesus himself recognized in the final crisis in Gethsemane. As he prayed it, this petition was neither fatalism nor Stoic resignation to what lay beyond his power, but the active, aggressive doing of God's will by which he turned what would have been just another fruitless tragedy into *creative* suffering. St. Paul, painfully studying the same lesson, found out how to use his sufferings as materials for the greater glory of God. Writing about his own physical affliction, which according to Gal. 4:13-15 was something repulsive to see, he says, "To keep me from being too elated by the abundance of revelations, a thorn was given me in the flesh, a messenger of Satan, to harass me, to keep me from being too elated. Three times I besought the Lord about this, that it should leave me; but he said to me, "My grace is sufficient for you, for my power is made perfect in weakness'" (II Cor. 12:7-9).

These limiting conditions are only another way of saying that every prayer, to be valid, must conform to the constitution of God's universe. By accepting them, Jesus made his death on the cross the means of taking away the sin of the world and of creating the life of the Spirit in all who believe in him; and Paul, persisting despite his physical handicap, glorified God by expending himself in the service of others (II Cor. 1:3-11, 4:7—5:10). This way of living is altogether different from blind, ox-like submission to "fate," which is an utterly irreligious conception. Thus we are invited to make all our needs and desires known to God, not that he does not already know them, but that in praying "As we forgive" and "Thy will be done" we place ourselves in position where he can act in us, and for us, and through us in the *best* of the various ways that are open to his overruling providence rather than in some harder way which may delay the achievement of his purpose and bring preventable suffering upon us and upon our fellow men.

Here, then, the pastoral counselor must find his answer to the despairing cry of so many patients who have become suddenly, and as they think, undeservedly ill, "Why did this have to happen to *me?* I have always tried to live right." To try to console them with the reflection that countless other good people have had to suffer likewise would only confirm them in their bitter, self-centered attitude toward

life. So the pastor will explain that, although Jesus and Paul never answered the question why God created a world in which there would be sin and suffering, or why he permits these tragedies to go on happening, they did something far better. Once when some people who liked to speculate about preexistence, fate, and predestination asked Jesus whether a man who was blind from his birth had sinned or his parents, he replied that neither had sinned, and then he proceeded to turn the man's plight into an occasion to glorify God by giving him sight. That is to say, the answer Jesus did give was not a theory but a creative act which showed his questioners how to glorify God by getting rid of evil and preventing it.

Jesus' way of using pain and suffering creatively as materials for living to the glory of God is the hardest of all life's lessons. Sooner or later every human being has either to learn it or break himself mentally and spiritually against it. To those who, like Jacob at Bethel, want to bargain with God this lesson comes all the harder. Fleeing the wrath of the brother whose birthright he had stolen, he had to sleep one night on a pillow of stone. When he awoke in the morning, he poured oil on the stone and set it up as a pillar, saying, "If God will be with me, and will keep me in the way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and clothing to wear, so that I come again to my father's house in peace, then the Lord shall be my God, and this stone, which I have set up for a pillar, shall be God's house; and of all that thou givest me I will give the tenth to thee" (Gen. 28:20-22).

Before a patient whose illness is complicated with this bargaining approach to God can be set free from his bitterness, he must be led to see that God's attitude to man is not that of a bargainer but that of human parents who want their children to grow up to love them not merely for what they are doing for them but for what they are in themselves. Originally the theory was that right living ought to exempt a man from suffering, and so indeed it ought. But as we see in the book of Job, this theory broke down as least twenty-five centuries ago. Yet men, like Job's friends, still cling stubbornly to the oversimplification of human life on which it was based. One of the psalmists could write: "A thousand may fall at your side, ten thousand at your right hand; but it will not come near you. You will only look with your eyes and see the recompense of the wicked. Because you have made the

Lord your refuge, the Most High your habitation, no evil shall befall you, no scourge come near your tent" (Ps. 91:7-10).

But the plague of leprosy did strike Job, even though he was "a blameless and upright man, who fears God and turns away from evil" (Job 1:8). The answer to his complaint is given, as we have seen, in the Gospel of John, where the necessity for creative suffering, which springs from man's misuse of his freedom and from the social solidarity which binds the righteous and the wicked together in one sheaf of life, is compared with the pangs of a woman in childbirth that are quickly forgotten in the joy of having brought new life into the world (John 16:21). The assumption in this Gospel and in Rom. 8:18-25 is that, whatever the reason for sin and sickness and death in the Creator's scheme of things, something incomparably glorious which otherwise would have been impossible is going to come out of the turmoil and tragedy. This is the deepest biblical insight into the mystery of pain and suffering. Whoever accepts it is on the way to a maturity of faith that will make him "more than conqueror" in every untoward experience of life.

The pastoral counselor who has grown into such a faith himself is the kind of man the writer of the letter of James has in mind when he says, "The effectual fervent prayer of a righteous man availeth much" (James 5-16 AV). But the essential condition for the effectiveness of his prayer is that the patient must believe that God has a purpose for him every day he allows him to live on this earth, and that the realization of that purpose constitutes an imperative reason for him to do his best to get well. He must be assured that his sins are forgiven, but also that he cannot avail himself of God's forgiveness unless, in the very act of doing so, he is forgiving his fellow men who have sinned against him. He must realize that, whether he gets well or dies is for God to decide, but that whatever happens he is in the care of his Father in heaven, who is infinitely kind, and who knows better than mortal man can imagine what is best for him both for time and for eternity, of which time is a part, infinitesimal indeed but still a part. And finally he must be willing to say "Thy will be done," not in the sense of resignation to fate but of cooperating with God to make his sickness and suffering work out creatively. To get the patient to see these things is the function of the clergy in this joint enterprise of faith and medicine. It is never a matter of faith *or* medicine, and as the

pastoral counselor goes about his task his own faith working with the faith of the patient *is* medicine at work.

III. The Role of the Physician

With respect to faith as a factor in healing, the function of the physician has much in common with that of the clergyman. Both in his own personal life and in treating his patients the doctor has to cope with the same spiritual and ethical problems as the minister. Together with his own burden he must help sick people to bear their load of sin, trouble, and worry. If he is spiritually sensitive, he soon discovers that this burden of creative suffering which he has assumed belongs to the very essence of the cross of Christ, and he is ready to sympathize with Jesus, who once, when confronted with an epileptic boy whom his quarreling disciples had been unable to help, cried out, "O faithless generation, how long am I to be with you? How long am I to bear with you?" (Mark 9:19). The history of medicine shows that physicians have always had to face the same callous indifference and active hostility to the changes necessary for the prevention and cure of disease which drew this agonizing cry from Jesus.

The resulting burden is so heavy that sometimes it seems as if the compensation of physicians and nurses, who have to listen all day to the complainings of their patients endlessly repeated, and who must put up with much impatience and ingratitude, ought to include exemption from sickness and pain for themselves. But a moment's reflection will indicate both the impossibility and the inadvisability of such an exemption. The preacher who wrote the New Testament letter to the Hebrews tells us that it was necessary even for Jesus to learn obedience through what he suffered, so that being made perfect he might sympathize with our weaknesses and become "the source of eternal salvation to all who obey him" (Heb. 4:15; 5:8-9). As all other men, the physician has to meet all the problems of living that arise from sin, suffering, and doubt, and in addition he has to make many ethical decisions on matters that belong to his profession. The ancient Oath of Hippocrates, which is still a sound basis for medical ethics, gives us some idea of what these problems have always been. Today the questions that grow out of changes in medical economics, birth control, and the extent to which modern medicines and surgical

techniques should be used to prolong the life of very old persons, when the prospect is only for continued relentless agony, demand more than ever before that the physician who has to decide on them have a deep and abiding sense of responsibility to God and a sense of God's purpose for his own life, together with an unfailing devotion to the service of his fellow man.

The effectiveness with which the physician can meet the deepest needs of his patients is proportionate to the depth of his own spiritual resources. In so far as the patient's incentive to live depends on his faith to believe that the work which God has planned for him to do in this world is not yet finished, the doctor's own example of devotion to the welfare of others will inspire and strengthen his will to get well. In at least one respect the physician is sometimes in better position than the clergyman to minister to the sick man's need of faith and purpose to go on living. This happens because people are prone to keep things from their pastor which of necessity they must reveal to their physician. But in order to inspire faith in God in those whom suffering has made receptive to it, the physician himself has to be a man of faith and prayer and of growing spiritual insight.

Seen in this light, the traditional division of labor which assigned the body to the physician, the soul to the clergyman, is obsolete. The fact that it is *not* the business of the pastor to diagnose disease and prescribe treatment, and consequently that he does not need to be expert in physiology and organic chemistry or in any of the other sciences which are the specialty of the medical profession, has led to a pernicious oversimplification of the problem where to draw the line between their respective functions. The growing emphasis on psychosomatic medicine which requires that the *whole* person be treated precludes the easy division which once relegated things spiritual to the clergy alone.

The misunderstanding which led to this futile attempt to put asunder what God has joined together has exposed doctors to the charge, for the most part unjustified, of having allowed their science to become "materialistic." This charge might not have been made so often if the education of those who made it had required of them at least enough discipline in mathematics and in the laboratories of the physical sciences to keep them from talking about matters concerning which they were not qualified to pronounce judgment. Not the least

salutary result of the rise of modern psychology is that our future clergy in the course of their training will have to pay much more attention to the physical and biological sciences from which the elective system in our high schools and colleges has been allowing too many to escape.

The "unified field theory" of faith and health desiderated by the article we are discussing calls for reconsideration of the former division of labor between the pastor and the doctor. The area of special competence for the clergy will, of course, properly continue to be the interpretation of God's revelation to man as set forth in the Bible, together with its development and continuous application to the ever-changing conditions of human life. But the preachers will now have to reckon with the fact that they can no longer simplify their task by dividing human existence into two areas, spiritual and material, and by separating the sixty-six canonical books of the Bible from their context in world history and treating them as if they contained *all* that God will ever have to say about his universe and man's relation to it. Even if it were legitimate interpretation to wrench the Scriptures loose from the stage of human development in which they were written, it would still be impossible to meet all the needs of modern man if God's revelation really had ceased eighteen centuries ago when the last books of the Bible were written. Scientists have to wrestle with many problems which the people of Bible times could not have understood, even if God, in some mechanical fashion had dictated the answers to the writers. In view of the fact that Christian theology has not yet succeeded in doing full justice to God's *material* universe as the home and the environment of beings with physical bodies who aspire to live the life of the Spirit, workers in the field of religion need to think more than twice before decrying the current emphasis on the physical sciences as "materialistic."

But these are the very reasons why the medical profession can no longer leave the exposition and development of man's understanding of God and his revelation solely to the clergy. The article in the *Journal* shows how and why medical men, in their search for a unified field theory of faith and health are broadening their interest to include research on "stress as a measurable factor in gauging an individual's physical condition." A principal component of this stress is the spiritual condition of the patient, which St. Paul has described as a slavery to

sin that keeps a man from doing what he would like to do because it is good and makes him do the evil he does not want to do (Rom. 7:13-20). In their investigation of this predicament, medical men have the opportunity to make one of their most significant contributions to the cooperative enterprise of faith and medicine. Stated in theological terms, this means that every doctor as well as every clergyman who studies the relation between a patient's religion (or lack of it) and his health of body and mind becomes a revelator of God's ongoing self-manifestation in and through his material universe.

To those who view the Bible as a book that contains all that God will ever reveal concerning his way of salvation for men, this proposal to regard medical research as a present-day medium for God's continuing revelation may seem like disloyalty to the faith once for all delivered to our biblical ancestors. But the concept of a closed revelation which dictates this objection is quite out of line, not only with facts which have come to light since Bible times, but also with Scripture itself in the Gospel of John, where God's revelation is still unfinished because it is concomitant with his work of creation that never ceases. In this Gospel, on Easter evening, Jesus says to his disciples, "As the Father has sent me, even so I send you," and he promises them that after he is gone they will do even greater works than he has done (John 14:12-15; 16:12-15; 20:21). These passages constitute the medical scientist's charter of freedom from the constriction formerly imposed on his research by the concept of a closed canon of revelation, so that he no longer needs to fear that recognition of God in his laboratory might vitiate his results.

The doctor therefore will not hesitate to regard his science as a modern means of God's continuing revelation of the nature of his universe and of his purpose for man. Rather the doctor will think of himself as a receptor and transmitter of this revelation to the present and to future generations of men. The history of science shows that the study and practice of medicine has indeed been one of the principal media of divine revelation. One-fourth of the New Testament—Luke and Acts—was written by a physician, and the Bible would be a very much smaller book if all the stories about sick folk were removed from it.

One reason why the science of medicine is so important a factor in God's continuing revelation is because, just as people used to go to

the physician only in emergencies, so they tend to be more receptive to the voice of God when they are sick than when they are well. In the language of our quotation from Shakespeare, as long as things are going well there may seem to be no need to think of God—"yet," and in the words of Euripides' *Trojan Women,* "there is something that doth seek, crying, for God, when one of us hath woe." Were it not for sickness, suffering, and death, it would probably be impossible for man the creature to distinguish himself from his Creator, and he might get the notion that he is God.

There are few areas in modern life in which Jesus' promise and call to do greater works than he did during his ministry in Palestine are being more strikingly fulfilled than in present-day theory and practice of medicine. Jesus healed a few lepers, but he left the cause and prevention of this loathsome disease for future generations to find out. Medical science has now opened the way to get rid of it, and if the nations were willing to spend a tithe of the money they are now wasting on war, they could soon wipe it off the face of the earth. Again, Jesus healed some fever-ridden persons, but he did not show his people how to prevent the spread of disease by killing off flies and mosquitoes. He healed many who were mentally ill, but he did not attack the belief that demons were the cause of their derangement—a belief that could make mental illness in those days when there were no hospitals as infectious as leprosy. The supposed activities of demons, being utterly capricious, could not be subjected to scientific control, whereas psychiatrists today analyze their cases in search of controllable causes of the diseases of mind and spirit; and psychiatry is the sphere of psychosomatic medicine's greatest impact on the interpretation of the Bible today and on every theology which has been based on the Bible.

Much has been revealed to and through our scientists concerning all these diseases since Jesus' day, and much more remains to be discovered. Hence this conception of an unfinished, ongoing revelation of God which not only gives new understanding of old truth but actually brings to light *new* truth never yet revealed to men is of the very greatest importance for the cooperation between religious faith and the theory and practice of medicine. It repudiates all misuse of the Bible that would bind the scientist to obsolete procedures and theories in the name of loyalty to a supposedly complete revelation and that would prejudice his deductions from newly discovered facts concerning

which that revelation has nothing to say. Unhampered by the constriction of mistaken ideas that clothe themselves with canonical authority and demand to be accepted simply on faith, he now has as much right to regard his discoveries as God's answers to his prayer as did the writers of the Bible, who in their own way, and first of all for their own times, were seeking to learn and obey the ways of God with men.

The conquest of polio is a typical example of what is meant by saying that the theory and practice of medicine is one of God's means of revealing himself to men. The article in the *Journal* quotes Dr. Herman N. Bundesen, president of the Chicago Board of Health, speaking of medical efforts before the advent of the Salk vaccine: "We did the best we could, but to tell the truth, about the only weapon against polio was prayer." But the point we are making here is that prayer is something more than the last resort when all other means have failed. The long and patient researches of the many scientists in many lands which finally led to a successful vaccine were also prayers, the tragedy being that so many people have not yet learned to regard scientific research as a form of prayer.

Man's prayer against polio has indeed been answered, but it has been answered the hard way, by endlessly patient research in the laboratories, just as the prayer against smallpox and many another disease has been answered. True prayer, which is the conversation of man's heart and mind with God, consists not only in praising God and making our requests known to him, but also in asking him questions about his infinitely complicated universe and about how to put ourselves into right relation with him and with the world in which he has placed us. Prayer may either be uttered or silent, but always, to be true prayer, it must spring from the petitioner's dominant desire, which in the case of the medical scientist is desire to find out just *how* God answers man's prayer for healing and what are the conditions to which we must submit in receiving the answer we need. Rightly viewed, the scientist's prayer in his laboratory, no less than the preacher's prayer in his pulpit, is a medium of God's own self-revelation to man.

Unless and until we learn and reconcile and adjust ourselves to God's physical and moral laws, our prayers remain unanswered. From this hard fact comes man's inveterate hunger for miracles, which are

generally sought for the benefit of some favored individual or group, and which, if granted, might only confirm the recipient in his lazy and selfish ways. Instinctively we feel that ethically there is something deeply wrong with this insistent demand for the short-cut of miracle and its undemocratic desire for a most-favored-individual treatment such as that in the Ninety-first Psalm, where the poet is untroubled by the torment of the thousand who fall at his side, or the ten thousand who perish at his right hand, provided that the destruction does not come near *him.* This is the feeling we have when we read in Oral Roberts' "Instructions for Those Desiring Prayer for Healing" that "white cards are for individuals who cannot walk through the Prayer Line. Only 50 white cards are given out each day. . . . You must wait until your color and card letter are called before entering the Prayer Line. *It is better not to come if you are unable to stay until your card is called.*" What, then, about all the millions of sufferers who will never be able to get into the line? What the medical scientist is seeking is healing for everybody in all times and in all places.

"Brother Roberts does not heal," says the Prayer Card, "only God can heal. Do not expect him to pray or talk long with you. Faith acts quickly. It is released in a moment of time. The instant Brother Roberts touches you his faith is released. Believe God, then, and you can be healed." But we have to ask whether instantaneity is really of the essence of faith-healing or whether it is an exigency of the modern assembly line which allows the healer only a moment for each unit in passing. However that may be, it is certain that building up hope for painless, immediate miraculous healing can have fatal consequences in case God does not choose that particular way to heal those who are thus led to expect a miracle.

It is with these dangers that the medical profession is especially concerned. A patient who is chronically and seriously ill may insist on traveling a long distance to the prayer line, and the strain of the trip may be fatal. Even when he gets there, he may not be chosen as one of the "fifty" who are given white cards and who are able to stay until their cards are called; and if he is granted access to the presence of the healer, he may not be healed—in which case disappointment may lead to fatal despair, or at least to disillusionment and bitterness. Moreover, if the patient who insists on being taken to a faith healer happens to be suffering from a contagious disease, he may transmit it to

others along the way; for example, no one will ever know how many people have contracted tuberculosis and other contagious diseases at Lourdes and other shrines of the healing cults. Meanwhile the hope for instantaneous painless healing may have led the sufferer to refuse or to delay what treatment his physician could still have given to save his life. All these dangers and possibilities are of common concern and require close cooperation between the physician and the clergyman.

In these cases the pastor's task is to persuade the patient to heed the advice of his physician, assuring him that it is not a matter of choosing either faith or medicine, but that his faith and prayers are much more likely to be effective if he does what the doctor tells him. In addition, as a theologian, the clergyman has his own special concern with the activities of the healing cults. His people, hearing of someone who has been restored to health by an itinerant faith healer, wonder why the regular preachers in the established churches cannot perform the same miracles, and the challenge is as old as the New Testament itself. The stories of the competition between Philip the Evangelist and Simon the Sorcerer of Samaria (Acts 8:9-24), and between Paul and the seven sons of Sceva who were exorcists in Ephesus (Acts 19:11-20) are typical examples. Simon's success as miracle-worker and practitioner of magic went to his head, so that the first thing he knew he thought that he himself was "Somebody Great," and the people of Samaria got him mixed up with their idea of God, saying, "This man is that power of God which is called Great." The history of faith-healing shows many an instance where, no matter how sincerely and conscientiously the miracle worker may have insisted that God was the healer, his followers have made the same mistake. Given the notion that a man can *command* the power of God, which is the very essence of magic, we have a very short step to his claim actually to *be* God; and even those who entertain the altogether fitting and proper conception of themselves as God's servants through whom he acts to heal the sick have constantly to guard against this same Luciferian estimate of themselves.

But when Simon saw the miracles that Philip and the twelve apostles were doing he perceived that he had to compete with a power greater than himself. So he offered them money to buy the Holy Spirit in order to further his ambition for Messianic control, and Peter refused the offer with a scathing denunciation: "You have neither part

nor lot in this matter, for your heart is not right before God." Neither were the seven sons of Sceva, who went down to defeat in their competition with the Christian evangelists, being ignominiously unsuccessful in their attempt to cast out a demon by using the name of Jesus as a magical charm. Their failure led the people of Ephesus to make a bonfire of books of magic worth ten thousand dollars.

The Christians characterized these non-Christian miracle workers as false prophets, but we must observe that they were false on ethical and spiritual grounds and not because they could not perform genuine miracles. Simon and the sons of Sceva did do miracles, and so did Apollonius of Tyana, the first-century Pythagorean missionary, and many others who were not Christians, not all of whose miracles can be dismissed as myths or legends just because they do not stand written in our canonical Scriptures. Priests at the shrines of Aesculapius the god of medicine, whose features as represented in Greek painting and sculpture served the early Christian artists as a model for the head of Christ, healed people in the name of their deity, as did also the priests of Isis and of other gods of healing. As at Epidaurus, near Corinth, the ruins of these temples, which were the ancient counterpart of our modern hospitals, have yielded many votive tablets that were set up by grateful patients to commemorate the miracles which had made them well. Some of the stories they tell are fantastic, but there can be no doubt that others are records of genuine cures.

This means that, as a factor in healing, faith was operative no matter what deity the sick man happened to be praying to. Furthermore, there are cases on record which raise the question whether the patient who has faith that he is going to be healed needs to believe in God at all, or whether his faith may be simply in the doctor, or in the medicine, or in both. An experiment reported in the *Journal* from Cook County Hospital in Chicago tells how seventy-four arthritis patients "were given pills and told they would get better. Half of the patients did show marked improvement. The pills were placebos—simple sugar. That may be called a manifestation of faith. But it also is a medical puzzle that begs a clinical solution rather than the glib explanation that somehow or other the doctor's influence and the patient's hopes combine to promote health."

From the doctor's point of view the problem presented by these phenomena is a matter of research to find out how to co-relate the

body and the spirit. From the clergyman's standpoint the problem is the same, but with the additional theological difficulty of explaining the fact that faith healing is not necessarily dependent on the patient's particular conception of God—a fact that calls for a thoroughgoing reconsideration of the value of miracles as proof of the claims that are made for any given religion. The task of the theologian is to establish a criterion to judge the claims of competing faith-healers and their systems. The test will be the adequacy and the moral and spiritual elevation of the underlying idea of God. The criterion applied by St. Paul was "the mind of Christ in the Christian," and in Phil. 2:1-11 and I Cor. 13:1-13 he has described what this mind is. Those who have it put God first, others second, and themselves as servants both of God and of their fellow men.

Although faith as a favorable factor in healing does not necessarily depend on any particular conception of God, a defective conception is bound to result in a misdirection of faith, which can easily be prostituted into sheer presumption. Whenever this happens, or is in danger of happening, the doctor has both the right and the duty to protect his patient and the public from the damage which such presumption can do. One of the worst examples of presumptuous misuse of Scripture is furnished by the snake-handlers of Tennessee, who claim Mark 16:9-20 as their warrant for putting God to the test in order to demonstrate their faith. There are other passages in the Bible which have been perverted in like manner. Jesus repudiated all suggestions that he produce some super-miraculous demonstration to prove his claims, because he regarded such conduct as tempting God (Matt. 4:5-7; Luke 4:9-12).

So the warfare of science against the quacks goes on. The article in the *Journal* shows how physicians, some of them occasionally acting as lay-preachers, are attacking this problem today. And when one of them preaches, his sermon is likely to be "a mighty stormy piece about responsibility to others." The only effective weapon against quackery is the challenge with which the late Professor Anton J. Carlson, of the physiology department of the University of Chicago, used to confront the luckless student who had been reckless enough to make a careless statement. "Vat iss the effidence?" and "Vat are your controls?" he asked; and of any one whom he considered a quack, he said, "He iss a fraud." In a paper entitled, "Science versus Life"

(*J.A.M.A.*, 1955), he wrote, "The great mass of the people of our age, even in the most enlightened countries, in their thinking and their motivation, are nearly as untouched by the spirit of science and as innocent of the understanding of science as was Peking man (cf. *Tower Topics*, University of Chicago, Jan. 1957, p. 9).

Faith healers generally show a marked aversion to Dr. Carlson's demand for *medical* evidence. They are more than likely to counter the challenge by charging their critics with lack of faith in God; and what evidence they do offer in proof of their cures is usually not amenable to rigid scientific control. More is required than the mere assertion of the patient and the healer that it was a cure of a given disease, and without scientific diagnosis before the healing and periodic checking afterward to see whether it is lasting, nothing certain can be made of the claim. The *Journal* quotes one minister who for six years has interviewed scores of invalids before and after they lined up at healing campaigns as saying, "I have never seen a vestige of physical change"; and the writer of the article goes on to say, "So far not a single 'healer' has submitted one of his 'cures' to medical examination. And yet the flamboyant cultists are collecting millions from elaborate radio, television, and tent performances. Often public health is endangered at these affairs as diseased persons mingle in the crowds, praying for a promised miracle. Equally shocking are the needless deaths and worsened conditions among the misled and crippled who delay or abandon ethical medical care in blind hopes of well publicized 'faith cures.'"

At the same time Professor Carlson set a high example of unselfish public service in the care of the sick and of the victims of our twentieth century perpetual world war. He devoted himself primarily to the discovery of the causes of disease and to the science of preventive medicine, toward which, by an evil quirk in human nature, the nations of the world have been grudging millions while squandering billions on the vain hope that they can establish peace by waging war. It is the function of physician and clergyman working together to persuade men and nations to seek peace by cooperating to heal and to prevent disease. The way in which both professions are now moving in this direction is a matter of living hope and strong encouragement for the future.

Through our physicians and nurses God is working for us today just as truly as he worked for the heroes of faith in Bible times, and

we have always to remember that if he heals through them the healing is still his work, less spectacular it may be than the instantaneous miracles desired by the impatient, but all the more wonderful for that. It is this consciousness of a common call to God's service of healing that must sustain the cooperators through long years of arduous work. The sense of God's high calling is essential, because compensation in money and gratitude, however ample, is not enough; and often they are called upon to render service without pay, and sometimes the patient, whose own suffering is immediate, imperious, and demanding, as if his were the only pain in God's universe, lacks even the grace of gratitude. Nothing less than the love of God and a sense of mission to work with him to perfect an unfinished world is adequate motivation when faith and medicine set out to work together.

The business of the church is not to go into the business of faith-healing by establishing and maintaining "prayer lines" for instantaneous healing apart from medicine. Our discussion will also have made clear the inadvisability of trying to revive the ancient custom of anointing the sick with oil (James 5:14-15), which could all too easily lead to superstition and magic. If the *medicinal* use of oil is indicated for any specific ailment, let the physician prescribe it. The clergyman's business is to pray with and for the patient and to persuade him to do what his doctor tells him, assuring him that it is never a case of either faith or medicine, but always of faith in God working through medicine.

The common aim of the doctor and the clergyman will be to achieve for themselves and for others that wholeness of life which is implied in the Hebrew *shalom* and in the Greek *eirene,* two biblical terms that can be translated only partially by our English *peace.* Both of these words mean total well-being, not only for time but for eternity, of which man's life-span here on earth is a significant infinitesimal fraction, because every moment of it has to be spent "near life, near death, near God," in whom "we live and move and have our being" (Acts 17:28). As the years go on, and as this cooperation between the doctors and the clergy increases, the instances of a "happy combination of fortuitous circumstances and favorable coincidences and a vast amount of cooperative effort" will no longer be unusual but common, everyday events. Then we shall see more and more clearly that God is just as near to us when we are well as when we are sick, in life as in death, and that good health for the *whole* man is the fruit of faith and medicine working together for the increasing glory of God.

The Lutheran Church and American Culture: A Tercentenary Retrospect

By Sydney E. Ahlstrom

IN the year 1649 a group of bold and conscientious laymen representing the hundred or more Lutheran families in the Dutch colony of New Amsterdam pledged themselves to the proper support of church and pastor in order that they could hear the Word of God and receive the sacraments according to the Augsburg Confession. Thereupon they sent a delegation to the consistory of the Lutheran Church in Amsterdam bearing their written request "for advice and assistance as to how they might obtain a pastor and the public exercise of religion. . . ."[1] To that heroic act, performed in the face of Governor Peter Stuyvesant's harsh intolerance and in defiance of governmental regulations, two congregations—St. Matthew's in New York City and Ebenezer in Albany, the oldest surviving Lutheran congregations in the United States—trace their origins.

Unfortunately the decisiveness of these dedicated colonists could not be matched in Amsterdam because in the Netherlands all worship or church organization outside of the Reformed Church was prohibited. Lutheranism existed only by extra-legal "connivance"; and to prevent even this state of affairs from obtaining in the colony, both the East India Company and the Estates General were urged by Reformed leaders to take a stern stand against any kind of religious toleration. For a long time after hearing the Macedonian cry, therefore, the consistory in Amsterdam saw fit to follow a policy of watchful waiting; and even four years later, upon receipt of a second petition, they could do no more than urge the struggling congregation in the New World "to assemble secretly for the observance of your religion." In the colony this advice was followed despite arrests, fines, and persecution. Then in 1657, after still a third visit from a New Amsterdam

1 Harry J. Kreider, *The Beginnings of Lutheranism in New York* (New York, 1949), pp. 16, 17. On New York Lutheranism I am also indebted to Kreider's *History of the United Lutheran Synod of New York and New England* (Muhlenberg, 1954) and *Lutheranism in Colonial New York* (New York, 1942).

emissary and in the belief that "connivance" would be allowed abroad, the Amsterdam consistory decided on positive action.

It is thus appropriate in 1957 to remember that on Friday, July 5, 1657, the Rev. Johannes Ernestus Gutwasser disembarked in Manhattan from the ship *"The Golden Hill."* He was a German by birth and had been recruited for this service either in Germany or in Amsterdam. On April 10 he had been ordained in the Old Lutheran Church of Amsterdam in a solemn and majestic service which Dr. Kreider has beautifully recreated.[2] After three months, however, the majesty was gone: Pastor Gutwasser was in hiding on a Long Island farm, whither he had been secreted to evade the deportation orders of the New Netherland Council. After about a year of furtive outdoor services, secret pastoral acts, uncertainty, and hunger, he returned to Manhattan to mend his broken health; but here he was arrested, placed in custody, and in the spring of 1659 put aboard a ship and returned to Amsterdam. After reporting to the Consistory there, he went back to Saxony, enrolled with the Lutheran consistory in Dresden, and thereafter disappears from the pages of history.

I

In this tercentenary year there is much to remember, much to ponder. First we pay our respects to the New Netherlands laymen who saw to it that the church was planted. This historic event continues to emphasize the cruciality of the laity to the church—and much in the subsequent 300 years of history could be used to illustrate the fact.

Second, we are bound to honor the piety and resolution of Pastor Gutwasser, who suffered two years of privation and persecution in a holy cause. And there would be no abuse of history in making him a symbol of all the other dedicated pastors who adorn the pages of the church's annals in this land.

Finally, we remember, though we can hardly be said to celebrate, the temporary triumph of harsh and unlovely religious intolerance. Even in this connection, however, our thoughts should center in thanks that times have changed rather than in recriminations. It was an intolerant age and a time of religious excitement when even greater violence might have been expected. It is worth remembering that only

2 Kreider, *Beginnings*, ch. 6.

in 1648 had the Peace of Westphalia been negotiated and the bloody carnage of the Thirty Years' War brought to an end. In the very year of the first call from New Amsterdam (1649) Puritan fury had unleashed itself in England and Charles I and Archbishop Laud were led to the scaffold. By the time Pastor Gutwasser arrived, the English Civil War had been fought and Oliver Cromwell's days were numbered. Indeed, his Commonwealth was to collapse in three more years, and four years after that King Charles II in a war with the Netherlands was to take control of New Amsterdam (1664) and grant toleration to Lutherans. Five years later he was even to charter the first Lutheran church in England itself. Yet let us not imagine Charles II as a magnanimous prophet of religious freedom: in England he was wreaking vengeance on the Puritans. Religious freedom, or even full toleration, became an active principle in political affairs and in church-state relations only very recently and only in certain areas.[3]

In the present essay, however, I do not plan to embark on any of these very worthy topics. My concern is to be with the inter-relation of the Lutheran Church and American culture. Being an historian, moreover, I shall consider this relationship as the dynamic, changing, historical thing that it has been during the past three centuries. I am convinced that the perception of the church in this fourth dimension—of time—is absolutely essential to our understanding of who we are, what we are, where we are going, and where we *ought* to be going.

My point of departure is provided by a broad generalization, namely, that the Christian church has in all ages and places been in a state of tension with its social surroundings. At least in its periods of greatness, the church has considered itself against or above the world—not identical with it, not at peace with it. A church that allows itself to fit into the customs and ideals of a culture is dead.[4] In America the danger of the church's slipping into this status of complacent irrelevance is especially great simply because everyone from the President on down is so positively eager to show his solicitude for religion and what are confidently referred to as "spiritual values." Obviously

3 E. George Pearce, *The Lutheran Church in Britain* (London: Concordia, Ltd., c. 1953).

4 H. Richard Niebuhr's *Christ and Culture* (Harper, 1951, now also in paper Torchbook) is a classic exposition of the church's possible orientations to the world. See also Howard Hong, *This World and the Church* (Augsburg, 1955); George W. Forell, *Faith Active in Love* (American Press, 1954); Edgar M. Carlson, *The Church and the Public Conscience* (Muhlenberg, 1956).

we are in the paradoxical position of having to be thankful for the freedom and respect for the church which is shown, yet worried about the results of overmuch kindness. Ironically we need the lesson that the Lutheran Church in the Soviet Zone of Germany is experiencing: that the world and the church are not one and the same thing! Being spared that awful experience—and yet being the poorer for it—we can, perhaps, gain some small measure of compensation by considering the special relationship of Lutheranism to the American environment in the broadest social *and* religious sense of that term.

II

One may plunge directly into the topic by considering those several characteristics of the American experience that are of most basic importance for virtually every Christian denomination that has existed here.

First in importance are democratic attitudes and methods of organization. Even the Roman Catholic heirarchy underwent a desperate struggle with a movement bent on obtaining lay-trusteeship of church property, and later in the nineteenth century "Americanism" became the name for a specific heresy when the pope condemned a too close *rapprochement* of Roman and democratic-American ideals and methods.[5] In traditions lacking these authoritarian controls the influences were deeper and more permanent. And these developments gain special significance from the fact that they opened up the churches in such a way that the second characteristic becomes almost equally important.

This second characteristic is as obvious as the preceding one: the enormous diversity of the American religious heritage. Nowhere in the world are so many forms of Christianity in contact with one another on a day-to-day basis.[6] In the United States the religiously homogeneous town scarcely exists; the homogeneous city has never

5 On the Roman Catholic trusteeship struggle, see works cited by John T. Ellis in *American Catholicism* (University of Chicago, 1956), pp. 43-50; and on its "Americanism" controversy, see Ellis, *James Cardinal Gibbons,* 2 vols. (Bruce, 1952); James H. Moynihan, *Archbishop John Ireland* (Harper, 1953); Patrick H. Aherne, *John J. Keane, Educator and Archbishop* (Bruce, 1955).

6 For brief surveys see Jerald C. Brauer, *Protestantism in America* (Westminster, 1953); John T. Ellis, *American Catholicism.* On the present situation: Frank S. Mead, *Handbook of Denominations* (Abingdon, 1956); Frederick E. Mayer, *The Religious Bodies of America* (Concordia, 1954); Elmer T. Clark, *Small Sects in America* (Abingdon, 1949); Leo Rosten, ed., *Religion in America* (Simon & Schuster, 1955).

existed. And the reason this is more than just another interesting fact is that churches are not static like the bits of glass in a kaleidoscope. It may even be that when they seem most dormant and lifeless they are borrowing from their neighbors most furiously. (They then sometimes wake up to discover that, in a sense, they do not exist any more!)

The third characteristic derives from both of the above-named factors. Because of our democratic political tradition and our religious diversity, the relegation of all but one denomination to a kind of tolerated "non-conformism" was unthinkable. Even in 1787 the Puritan establishments in the New England commonwealths were legal anachronisms, and within a half-century they had been swept away. The principle of independent, voluntary churchmanship became, therefore, a basic American tradition.[7]

The fourth characteristic is less specific; it stems from the violent historical change incident to America's short but turbulent history. Just to mention the major phases of our development is to suggest the staggering problems that have conditioned American churches; colonization, westward movement, mass immigration, the rise of the city, and the twentieth century technological revolution (whose symbol is perhaps not so much the atomic bomb as the suburban supermarket).

Democracy, pluralism, independence of government, deep-reaching social transformations—these are the factors that make American church history an exciting thing; and it shall be part of my purpose in what follows to survey certain aspects of this history which have been especially fateful for the Lutheran Church in America. The theme of this survey, furthermore, is suggested by the words "especially fateful." Put less mysteriously: the interaction between the Lutheran Church and the totality of American culture (including its religious aspects) is seen as of unusually strong significance; in an important sense of the term, as unique.

Certain historical considerations will illustrate this contention. Consider, for example, how different the Lutheran experience is from that of, say, the German Reformed despite a common language and cultural background. The German Reformed Church almost certainly also had members in Peter Stuyvesant's New Amsterdam; but they

7 See Anson Phelps Stokes, *Church and State in the United States*, 3 vols. (Harper, 1950); G. Elson Ruff, *The Dilemma of Church and State* (Muhlenberg, 1954); Leo Pfeffer, *Church, State and Freedom* (Beacon, 1953).

apparently had no difficulty coming to terms with the Dutch churches of the colony. The Church of the Netherlands, in fact, was deeply indebted both confessionally and theologically to the German tradition rooted in the Heidelberg Catechism; and for a long time the German Reformed in America were under Dutch care. At a later time, when language barriers were broken down, the German Reformed would also begin to realize their close relationship to American Presbyterianism. And in a still larger sense they would learn increasingly to sense their kinship with the whole Puritan and Calvinistic tradition which at one time ran so deeply in the Congregational and Baptist churches.[8] Anglicans (or Episcopalians), to be sure, did stand apart from this tradition, as Lutherans did; but they, on the other hand, could identify themselves with the church of the mother country during the entire colonial epoch down to 1776, and more profoundly still they could regard themselves as the root from which all the populous stems of English-American Nonconformism had sprung. Moreover, they were English, as were the fundamental institutions and traditions of the country, and during the first century and more of American history Anglicans stood very close to the Reformed tradition in theology.[9] I would argue, therefore, that Lutheranism is best understood when it is seen not as something indistinguishably blended in with the luxuriant foliage of American denominationalism but as a tradition living in a real but fruitful state of tension with American church life.

The only other major traditions in this same circumstance are the Roman Catholic Church and the various branches of Eastern Orthodoxy. The Lutheran Church is thus the only forthrightly, unambiguously, unequivocally *evangelical* church to be in this position.

8 See Joseph H. Dubbs, *The Reformed Church, German,* American Church History Series, Vol. VIII (1895). John Williamson Nevin, the real heart of the nineteenth century "Mercersburg Movement," was a "Princeton Presbyterian" until he came to the German Reformed seminary as a professor. The present-day merger of Congregationalists and the E. & R. Church indicates the same trend. Nevin's *The Mystical Presence* (1846), incidentally, is a trenchant critique of the state of religion in his day; and Lutherans do not escape his gaze: "It is notorious that the American Lutheran Church . . . has given up altogether the sacramental doctrine of Luther, and along with this (for the two things can never be sundered) the original genius and life of the Lutheran Confession" (p. 106n). His reference is directed especially at *The Lutheran Observer.*

9 With the passing decades, especially after the Anglican (Oxford) revival of the nineteenth century, the Episcopal situation in America has more and more approximated the Lutheran. See Wm. W. Manross, *The Episcopal Church in the United States* (Morehouse-Gorham, 1950); George E. DeMille, *The Catholic Movement in the American Episcopal Church* (Church Historical Society, 1941).

At the same time it is the only evangelical church in America that is historically, confessionally, and liturgically part of the immemorial catholic tradition of the church. Moreover, its cultural background was Continental, not British. There is an excellent symbolism in those three great relief statues on the tower of the new chapel at Wittenberg College: St. Paul, St. Augustine, and Luther, representing as they do the Lutheran Church's witness to the holy Word, to the church's living tradition, and to the purifying impulses of the Reformation. Yet it can not be said that those three men blend indistinguishably into the American scene!

What degree of consent this analysis of the situation will win is problematic. Probably the agreement will be considerably less than total, for this touches on a major problem of interpretation. It is a problem, moreover, which is posed by the most recent account of Lutheranism in America, Professor Abdel Ross Wentz's *Basic History*. I would hope, incidentally, that my remarks will not be taken as "basic" criticism of that most excellent work. I would gladly join some third-order of the Gideon Society that was seeking to put a copy in every home. The book is indispensable.

At the same time I must dissent from a very important motif that pervades the book and is stated in the Preface:

> The position of the Lutheran church in America rests upon a birthright. It is not an immigrant church that needed to be naturalized after it was transplanted from some European land. It is as old as the American nation and much older than the American republic. The Lutheran church in America is an integral and potent part of American Christianity. The people in the Lutheran churches of the land are a constituent and typical element of the American nation.
>
> This reciprocal relationship between American culture and the American Lutheran church can be properly understood only in the light of the historical perspective. The church and the nation were born at the same time, grew up side by side, and developed by similar stages of progress.[10]

In disagreeing with Professor Wentz, however, let me make three matters very clear: First, this is a matter of emphasis and nuance that reveals itself in various shades of valuation and interpretation. Most of the factual, external history of the tradition is unaffected. Second, the issue does not logically have any relationship to confessional positions. Dr. Wentz could hold his view and easily be a much more rigorous and conservative Lutheran than I am, or *vice versa*.

10 *A Basic History of Lutheranism in America* (Muhlenberg, 1955), p. v.

Third, there is nothing particularly unusual about the attitude toward Lutheran history which I am asking for. Dr. Martin E. Marty, indeed, has recently referred to it as the "cliché-version."[11] I venture to say, moreover, that most Lutherans have in the past regarded this "cliché-version" as axiomatic; and most American church historians, regardless of denominational affiliation, have agreed. The point of the present essay, however, is not to repeat the axiom (if such it be) but to make some relevant extrapolations into the present.

III

The situation can probably best be grasped if we divide the history of American Lutheranism into its major phases, each of which had its special problems and distinctive character. The three phases are obvious enough: the colonial, the transitional, and the modern. But unlike many historical periods, these can be fairly clearly dated and defined, so I shall in due course give them names.

The first is that heroic time of which I shall say little because others have said so much and because we all have been made aware of the fundamental problems of a colonial church, if nothing else, by the memorable adversities of the Pilgrim Fathers. The early Lutherans in New Amsterdam faced these problems; so in an only slightly different way did the church in New Sweden, planted in 1638.[12] Then as the decades passed by, this colonial Lutheran Church began to experience a new crisis. It now was not so much in danger of extinction as it was of absorption. The prime example of what could happen was provided by the Swedish Church on the Delaware, which simply disappeared into colonial Anglicanism like the Humboldt River disappears into the sands of Nevada.

For the larger German groups in New York and Pennsylvania this threat of absorption was not so great because their numbers were

11 See his review of Wentz's book in *Church History*, XXVI (March, 1957), p. 90. To my knowledge the only large work devoted to this "cliché-version" is Dr. Paul W. Spaude's *The Lutheran Church under American Influence* (Lutheran Literary Board, 1943) which is sub-titled "A Historico-philosophical Interpretation of the Church in its Relation to Various Modifying Forces in the United States." It would be easy to criticize this book: it is crabbed, narrow, and obscurantist—in many respects one of the most hopelessly pre-critical books ever to flow from an American Lutheran pen. Yet it shows an awareness of the problem, is heavily documented and extremely broad in scope.

12 Except for quotations I am not citing references to standard works on American Lutheran history. See Wentz's bibliography.

larger and because there was a continuous influx of immigrants. Even so, it is interesting that as late as 1797 the New York Ministerium officially declared that it would "never acknowledge a newly established Lutheran church that uses only the English language in a place where the members may participate in Episcopal services."[13] For a long time there was a steady stream of German Lutherans moving into Episcopal churches; and this was due not only to the "language question" but also to the fact that the Episcopal churches tended less often to lose their tradition of ordered liturgical worship. William A. Muhlenberg is perhaps the most famous of those who made this move—and in his case a combination of factors, including the low state of Lutheran worship, account for the change.[14]

But of course the Episcopal Church was not the only absorbent: many Lutherans lived in areas where Episcopalians never ventured. In these places inroads were made by other traditions, especially those that had the benefit of German language.[15] Until the time of Henry Melchior Muhlenberg's work (1742-87), and indeed long after that, there was much religious chaos among the German-speaking peoples of Pennsylvania, and this circumstance conduced to denominational dispersion and breakdown.

Yet absorption was not the only threat to the colonial church. To change the figure, there was the total destructive impact of the Age of Reason. And this took its toll in all the churches, the Episcopal most of all, but hardly less in Congregationalism, where seventy-five years of growing tension finally brought the Unitarians into existence in 1815. The chief Lutheran representative of this trend was Frederick Henry Quitman, president of the New York Ministerium (1807-1825), friend of the first explicitly Unitarian president of Harvard University, and the author of a catechism to replace Luther's. As Dr. Kreider rightly says, he "brought German Rationalism to full flowering in American Lutheran theology."[16] In the western regions of the country, where the cosmopolitan influences of the Enlightenment did not penetrate, revivalism had a complementary impact, but these in-

13 Kreider, *Synod of New York and New England*, p. 34

14 Anne Ayres, *William Augustus Muhlenberg* (Harper, 1880), chs. II, III.

15 Aside from the German Reformed and the Moravians, two new Methodistic movements are especially important: the United Brethren in Christ, founded c. 1800 by Philip William Otterbein, and the Evangelical Association, founded c. 1803 by Jacob Albright.

16 Kreider, *Synod of New York and New England*, p. 43.

roads belong chiefly to the second phase of Lutheran history, soon to be discussed.

As the colonial period drew to a close, therefore, and as the newly-founded American republic faced its destiny, the Lutheran Church was anything but strong. Little more than one American in fifteen was a church member at all, and only a tiny fraction were Lutheran. Even many of these were scattered in little enclaves or as completely isolated families from Georgia to New York. Synods were, to be sure, in existence and the General Synod, which would attempt to achieve some kind of national organization, was just over the horizon. Yet only struggling litttle Hartwick existed to educate a ministry; liturgical, hymnological, and theological matters were in a state of decadence and confusion. Things were at a low ebb generally. The best that can be said is that the leaders of the church seemed to have been surprisingly free of a minority, sectarian psychology and worked with a genuine churchly concern for the future. The colonial age, nevertheless, was for Lutherans "The Age of Survival."

IV

The 19th century changed all that. "The Age of Survival" was brought to an end by the momentous facts of emigration and immigration. What caused millions of people from Lutheran lands to leave their homes is too large a subject for this inquiry; so are the national developments that opened up the endless stretches of land and opportunity in America.[17] The basic facts are what concern us here—and these facts are writ bold and clear.

Immigration, of course, did not begin suddenly in the year 1800, or any other year. Muhlenberg's *Journals* indicate a steady stream of new arrivals a half-century earlier. But after the War of 1812 and the defeat of Napoleon, the state of affairs began to change radically; and they continued to change overwhelmingly through the remainder of the century. For Lutheranism the half-century after 1840 was most important; and when it was over, "survival" was no longer a problem. Lutherans were the fifth, soon to be the fourth, largest re-

17 See Oscar Handlin, *The Uprooted* (Little, Brown, 1952); Marcus L. Hansen, *The Great Migration* (Harvard Univ., 1945) and *The Immigrant in American History* (Harvard Univ., 1942); Carl F. Wittke, *We Who Built America* (Prentice-Hall, 1945).

ligious group in the country.[18] Vigorous synods had been formed in nearly every part of the nation. Colleges, seminaries, and schools were in existence; and the constituency was served by many publishing houses and a wide array of periodicals.

As is generally well realized, it was not an age without its problems. Most basic were the difficult problems of church work on the frontier. But these are classic aspects of American folklore and need no repetition here. More specifically Lutheran were the questions which made these decades "The Age of Definition."

Immigration helped mightily to precipitate what Vergilius Ferm has made known as "The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology." Perhaps the end-result was always too clearly implicit in the situation to justify the word "crisis"—yet the issue was clearly enough drawn. An American Lutheranism, long cut off from much of its tradition and heavily compromised by rationalistic, revivalistic, and Reformed influences, was challenged by a far more rigorous theological and ecclesiastical tradition. Strong and fresh in the minds of the newly arriving church leaders were two important European developments: (1) the great evangelical revivals which did so much to revive the ideals of Pietism and bestir the churches of Germany and Scandinavia; and (2) various movements of doctrinal recovery that had also arisen both in Germany and Scandinavia to counter trends toward Rationalism and Idealism. But not all who led the American movements were European-born. There were men in America who had maintained contact with these European trends and who became leaders of an indigenous movement. In this latter group, Charles Porterfield Krauth was probably the most distinguished.[19]

As for the events of the controversy itself, perhaps Samuel S. Schmucker's Definite Synodical Platform of 1855 and the formation of the General Council in 1867 are sufficient to call them to mind.

18 H. K. Carroll, *The Religious Forces of the United States,* American Church History Series, Vol. I (1893), p. 397. According to the 1890 census the six largest denominations were as follows (in second column are recent figures as reported by Mayer, *op. cit.,* p. 568):

Roman Catholic	6,257,871	30,425,015
Methodist	4,589,284	11,660,549
Baptist	3,717,969	17,762,763
Presbyterian	1,278,332	3,647,966
Lutheran	1,231,072	6,745,687
Episcopal	540,509	2,545,449

19 Ferm's work (Century, 1927) is invaluable; but many more biographical works and specialized studies are needed.

Much was clarified during those and succeeding years. But now, in the perspective of another seventy-five years, it becomes increasingly clear that this "Age of Definition" left a deep imprint on the Lutheran Church in America that was for a long time veiled by the fact that ultimately the church did take its stand upon its historic confessional basis. To get these facts into proportion we must look beyond the specifically controversial scene.

These were also the decades when the Methodist and Baptist denominations grew from insignificant movements into the two largest Protestant denominations in the country. It was, in other words, the age *par excellence* of frontier revivalism—and not only in Baptist and Methodist circles, one might add. Up-state New York in the mid-nineteenth century was referred to as the "burned-over district," so frequent and violent were the revivals that swept its country-side. Spiritualism, Adventist movements, and the Mormons grew out of the ferment. But the most prominent leader of them all, the father of modern revivalism, was Charles G. Finney, a Presbyterian become Congregationalist of sorts and an itinerant revival-preacher become professor of theology and then president of Oberlin College.[20]

In at least one respect Finney's work had a direct effect on Lutheran history in that the Franckean Synod, which was formed in 1837 by a group within the Hartwick Synod, was led by men who had been caught up in Finney's fiery preaching. Yet in a larger sense, Finney and the Franckean Synod are but symbols for the pervasive influence of revivalism that entered into the life of almost the entire Lutheran Church, merging there with the Pietistic traditions that smouldered even in the souls of many a Missourian. Preaching for decision, the demand for a regenerate church membership, superficial legalism, and even Finneyite and Methodistic perfectionism found their way into Lutheran thought and practice. More insidious still was the infiltration of an anti-theological, even an anti-doctrinal bias, that tended to stifle religious thought and teaching even when it did not lead to marked doctrinal deviation. Finally and most unfortunately,

20 On these western movements and nineteenth century revivalism see Timothy L. Smith, *Revivalism and Social Reform* (Abingdon, 1957); W. R. Cross, *The Burned-Over District* (Cornell Univ., 1950); W. W. Sweet, *Religion in The Development of American Culture* (Scribners, 1952), as well as his *Revivalism in America* (Scribners, 1944) and his four-volume *Religion on the Frontier*, documents; Warren A. Candler, *Great Revivals and the Great Republic* (Nashville, 1904). There is no adequate volume on Finney, but see Gilbert H. Barnes, *The Anti-Slavery Impulse* (New York, 1933).

the very effects that Pietism and Rationalism had had in thinning out the Lutheran sense of worship were accentuated. In Lutheran seminaries pure doctrine was taught, the historic distinctions between Calvinistic, Zwinglian, and Lutheran doctrines of the Holy Communion were duly emphasized, the centrality of sacramental theology was acknowledged. But in many broad areas Lutheran church life became increasingly adapted to the ways of "American Evangelical Protestantism." In retrospect, therefore, the "Age of Definition" may be seen as a time when Lutheran doctrine came to prevail in the Lutheran Church, but also as a time when, much more than we usually realize, Reformed and Methodistic practice came to prevail.

V

Then in 1921 and 1924 came the immigration laws that mark the end of an epoch in American history: the gates were closed. The Lutheran influx had, of course, dwindled to a trickle long before that, but even so, these years between 1914 and 1924, containing as they do both the harsh indignities of wartime prejudice and the closing of immigration, also mark an era in American Lutheran church history. The three decades which have followed have been years of re-examination and self-recognition. Perhaps we may call this "The Age of Consolidation." Divisions created by nineteenth-century controversies were healed. In 1918 the United Lutheran Church was formed. A year before that most of the divided strands of Norwegian Lutheranism were brought together. In 1929, as an example of the interior consolidations that were also progressing, the (then) three synods which make up the present Synod of New York and New England enjoyed an exultant reunion. Two years later the large Iowa and Ohio Synods concluded their long process of negotiation with organic merger. And in the meantime both the National Lutheran Council (1918) and the American Lutheran Conference (1930) had come into existence.

Beneath all this organizational activity there was something much more profound than sentimentality and ethnic yearnings. Lutherans were much affected by those deep soundings of the evangelical and catholic tradition of the church that have marked the years since World War I throughout the Christian world. This has been a many-sided movement, involving the combined endeavors of the theologian,

the biblical and historical scholar, and the reformers of Christian worship. Much credit is due the work that emanated in 1906 from the study of a musically-inclined pastor in Strasbourg—for Schweitzer's *Quest of the Historical Jesus* signalized a new attitude toward the previous century's attempt to make a middle-class European out of Jesus Christ. Then in 1918 came Karl Barth's bombshell on the playground of the theologians, and in 1921 the *Römerbrief* came out in an even more forceful second edition.

It can hardly be said that these momentous stirrings made an immediate impression in America; nor can it be said that Lutherans were in the vanguard of those Americans who did slowly begin to respond. Yet some were; and increasingly *sola scriptura* and *sola gratia* took on new meaning in Lutheran life and thought. Not because the Word of God was being discovered anew—as was the case in many traditions—but because its relevance and force were being realized. Biblical scholarship and biblical theology were found to be mutually helpful in making the message and spirit of Holy Scripture more meaningful and urgent. During the 1930's Professor David L. Swenson began those labors which were to make him, along with Walter Lowrie, a father of American Kierkegaard studies. Other Americans were becoming involved in the "Luther Renaissance" that was developing in Scandinavia and Germany. With great help from various Englishmen, the new scholarship began to make an impression. In ever-widening circles the work of Swedish churchmen—Nygren, Aulén, Brilioth, and the others—began to be known.

Preceding these developments, in quite another area of endeavor, the Common Service, which grew out of long years of study and negotiation, became an important force both for Lutheran unity and for a deepened understanding of Christian worship. Not only was it adopted by the ULCA but it became the official English form of worship for the new ALC, was adopted by the Missouri Synod, and found its way into the Augustana and ELC hymnals. This liturgy had a symbolic meaning, too, for it pointed to a new and deeper movement of renewal and reform that was related in no small measure to the renaissance of Reformation studies. It blazed the trail for a veritable "new Pietism" whose aim was the recovery of private Christian devotion and the restoration of corporate worship.

All these trends were interrelated, and taken together they con-

stitute the most important things that have happened to the inner life of the twentieth century church in America.[21] In fact, one reason for their fruitfulness is that Lutherans, being no longer faced only by the barren alternatives of Fundamentalism and Modernism, have not been isolated. Ecumenical conversations broken off for centuries have been resumed.

But let us not fool ourselves, nor be lulled into any false sense of security. The signs of promise we mention are by no means an adequate picture of the present-day state of the church. These are days when the pieties of usefulness are sweeping the country. Everywhere we hear men proclaiming the religion of religiosity and asking only for faith in faith, belief in belief. And the tawdry heresies of Norman Vincent Peale do not constitute the only evil. His imitators are legion. All over the land "community churches" are springing up with group-dynamics as their gospel. Even from many "orthodox" pulpits there is resounding nothing more substantial than the weak sentimentality of Sallman's Jesus.[22]

Surging beneath all this superficiality (and no doubt helping to cause it) is one of the greatest social revolutions since the age of the Renaissance and Reformation. Industrialism and technology are transforming our social structures faster than we can adapt ourselves. Suburbs are growing six times as fast as the national population. Hundreds of thousands of Americans are living in "mobile homes," and millions of them are changing their economic and social status or are moving to new positions with large corporations or the government with such frequency that they might as well be in trailers. Every year a lower percentage of the Americans getting married have even a ghost of an idea where they will be buried. My father-in-law, with

21 On these twentieth century developments (besides primary works) see John Dillenberger & Claude Welch, *Protestant Christianity* (Scribners, 1955); Taito A. Kantonen, *Resurgence of the Gospel* (Muhlenberg, 1948); Daniel D. Williams, *What Present-Day Theologians are Thinking* (Harper, 1952); Edgar M. Carlson, *The Reinterpretation of Luther* (Muhlenberg, 1948); Edwin E. Aubrey, *Present Theological Tendencies* (Harper, 1936); E. B. Koenker, *The Liturgical Renaissance in the Roman Catholic Church* (Univ. of Chicago, 1954); G. K. A. Bell, *The Kingship of Christ* (Penguin Books, 1954) on the ecumenical movement; and Paul A. Carter, *The Decline and Revival of the Social Gospel* (Cornell Univ., 1956).

22 I considered these trends at somewhat greater length in "The Levels of Religious Revival," *Confluence*, IV (April, 1955), pp. 32-43, and in "The Pieties of Usefulness" (forthcoming *Bulletin* of Stetson University, DeLand, Fla.), the first lecture in a series which I expect soon to publish as a whole.

a 150-year-old, now "suburbanized" parish on Long Island, reports that 95% of his congregation was baptized elsewhere; and his situation is not unusual.

In this situation of unrest, uncertainty, and social insecurity there are hundreds of thousands of uprooted people seeking out the churches for no better reason than that they need the kind of identity that membership in so inclusive a family organization will give them. In many areas these members of "the Lonely Crowd" are being admitted faster than efforts to Christianize them can be carried out, and the church is threatened with secularization. On the other hand, the social pressures are so strong, and the temptation for the church to center its work in what we call a "variegated social program" are so overpowering that churches frequently become incapable of absorbing any new members who are not of precisely the same social and intellectual status as those already in. Many details could be added, but even now it must be clear that there is no simple reply to the question recently posed by the president of the National Council of Churches: "Is the religious boom a spiritual bust?" The answer is both Yes and No.[23]

More important is the need to question our own American experience with a view to finding the foundations that will give us strength and stability in these times of tumultuous and deep-reaching transition. In this historical problem we come to the central purpose of my essay. And nothing seems better suited to sharpen the issue than a distinguished address delivered by Professor Marcus L. Hansen on "The Problem of the Third Generation Immigrant." "Hansen's Law," as it has been called, can be set forth as follows: What the second generation tries to forget, the third generation seeks to remember. Will Herberg has recently found this "law" a very useful tool for interpreting present religious interests in America. He sees a vast, secularized multitude reviving the religious traditions of their grandfathers. I am not sure, however, but what his theory is more applicable to American Jewish history than to anything else, though on the surface

23 On some aspects of these social trends see David Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd* (Doubleday Anchor, paper, 1955) and "Some Informal Notes on American Churches and Sects," *Confluence,* IV (July, 1955), pp. 127-159; W. H. Whyte, *The Organization Man* (Simon & Schuster, 1956); C. W. Mills, *White Collar* (Oxford, 1951) and D. M. Potter, *People of Plenty* (Univ. of Chicago, 1954). Herberg (cited below) gives many other bibliographical suggestions.

it would seem to apply to Lutherans as well. (Especially, for example, to Finnish Lutherans, the great bulge of whose immigration to this country came at very nearly the same time as that of East-European Jewry.)[24]

Yet I do find the generation-concept meaningful. I remember standing at the door of my home church in Minnesota one day and remarking (as a possibly typical member of the third generation) that I wished the Swedish biblical quotation over the chancel arch had not been replaced by an English one. Standing nearby was a very elderly lady (from the first generation) who immediately voiced her agreement and said that she had wept the Sunday she discovered the change. But no sooner had *she* finished than a man twenty years my senior (from the second generation) asserted in most positive tones that it was the best thing that ever happened to the parish and that "a good many other things ought to get the works in the same way." Everyone knows the types represented in my little sequence; and I wonder if it does not suggest both the strength and the weakness of the Hansen-Herberg formula as applied to Lutheran history.

The crux of the difficulty is the fact that the little drama I recounted is not tied to the present. It has been repeated thousands or millions of times ever since there appeared a third generation of Swedish-Americans on the Delaware. No one generation has ever been able to define the issue because the Lutheran Church, like the American nation, was constantly being augmented by new streams of immigrants. And because the immigrants ordinarily preferred partially settled areas to the frontier proper, Pennsylvania, New York, and Ohio synods were affected in the same manner as those in the Middle West. A very real and possibly unresolvable tension did exist throughout the church, therefore; but it was two- and not three-sided. On one side were those more or less Americanized peoples whose primary concern was for an English-speaking church adapted to the dominant modes of piety and religious practice in nineteeth century America. On the other were those who saw the primary responsibility of the church in terms of the vast numbers of immigrants both in the land and still arriving. There naturally were countless other positions,

24 Hansen's lecture was published by the Augustana Historical Society, Rock Island, Ill. (1938); Will Herberg, *Protestant-Catholic-Jew* (Doubleday, 1955).

some mediating, some more extreme; but whatever the case, no simple succession-of-generations theory can suffice.

But there is a figurative sense in which it can be used, because we are *all* third-generation in one very important way. Lutherans are at a point in their history where for the first time they are not perplexed, frustrated, and torn by the old dilemma. The language question, for one thing, is settled; and the old choice between American and European loyalties has been transcended. As never before, the American Lutheran Church is in a position to take stock of its heritage.

VI

As we undertake this task, we find much on the credit side of the ledger, much to be thankful for; and though these gifts of the American tradition are obvious to the point where platitudes are unavoidable, they deserve review if only to keep the record straight. That they show a close resemblance to the "characteristics" of the American experience described earlier is perhaps inevitable, yet brevity is thereby made easier. Let us give thanks, then, for—

(1) A tradition of democratic church organization wherein a strong and full participation by the lay-membership was both necessary and expected;

(2) An unambiguous and law-upheld tradition of religious freedom that seldom has allowed churches to be tempted into harsh treatment of other churches and religions, but which forces them to advance their work on its own merits and not by compulsion and non-religious measures;

(3) A strong sense of evangelistic obligation born in part of this very freedom and our extreme religious pluralism and made a living part of church life to the exclusion of widespread automatic (and hence merely nominal) church membership;

(4) An independence of state support which requires voluntary support of the church and a lively sense of stewardship.

I hope that nothing I say will be taken to negate my gratitude for these incalculably valuable gifts. I am in no sense suspicious of things because they are American! But one thing must be kept in mind in making an overall estimate: the nineteenth century, during which so much that was American made its mark on Lutheranism, was in many respects the lowpoint in American churchmanship. The

churches were so involved in keeping up with a nation that was expanding faster than any nation in history that they had no time for second thoughts and very little time even for first thoughts. Consequently the "American Evangelical Protestanism" that historians like Ralph Henry Gabriel and Sidney E. Mead have shown to be such a homogeneous religious complex is hardly the kind of tradition from which many treasures can be brought.[25] In other words, the foundations that America's rapidly growing churches put underneath the various departments of church life were often improvised, hastily conceived, defective, misplaced, or non-existent. I would insist, therefore, that the twentieth century church must build these foundations anew in every applicable case.

Hymnody and church architecture are two of the more obvious and painful instances of this nineteenth century blight. I cite them merely as incontrovertible illustrations within immediate reach of ear and eye. More important matters, unfortunately, do not appear so near the surface, and it is clearly beyond any one person's capacity to deal with them, regardless of how brash such a person may be. I am only brash enough to discuss three general topics, and these only in a practical, non-theological way. Noticeably untouched, in fact, will be systematic theology—chiefly because most Lutheran churches dealt decisively with doctrinal "Americanism" during the past century. Moreover, I am not a theologian. But it does not take a theologian to see that in confronting the present-day situation there is much that needs to be said about the three topics I do single out for brief consideration: preaching, teaching, and worship.

1. *Preaching.* In bringing up this topic it may appear that I am merely trying to be difficult. "Is not the Lutheran Church," you may ask, "almost universally known as a church where the Word is faithfully preached?" And the answer (hopefully) is Yes. The Word is honored in our symbolical writings; our seminarians are taught to put themselves under its yoke; the lectionary is in every hymnal and

25 Ralph Henry Gabriel, *The Course of American Democratic Thought* (Ronald Press, 1956). Sidney E. Mead's articles on this topic are scattered: "The Rise of the Evangelical Conception of the Ministry in America (1607-1850)," in H. R. Niebuhr and D. D. Williams, eds., *The Ministry in Historical Perspectives* (Harper, 1956); "American Protestantism during the Revolutionary Epoch," *Church History,* XXII (Dec., 1953); "Denominationalism; the Shape of Protestantism in America," *Church History,* XXIII (Dec., 1954); "From Coercion to Persuasion: Another Look at the Rise of Religious Liberty and the Emergence of Denominationalism," *Church History,* XXIV (Dec., 1956), and others.

the Bible in every home. But on the basis of my own personal observations, I am forced to conclude that American Lutheranism has allowed its traditional conception of exegetical, expository preaching to languish. American Lutheran sermons are often mere wandering "occasional pieces," as cluttered by anecdote, sentimental human-interest stories, and the bric-a-brac picked up in volumes of "sermon helps" as are American sermons generally. Exceptions there obviously are, fortunately many; but it is not enough to rest on laurels which Martin Luther won! We need preachers who place themselves squarely in the tradition of proclaiming the Gospel in an existentially relevant way into the teeth of sin, guilt, and the devil.

The ethos created by American Evangelical Protestantism during the nineteenth century did not conduce to great preaching. It is not enough to shout "The Bible says . . ." in the Billy Graham manner. Nor was Modernism any better; we must do more than speak admiringly of the New Testament's moral imperatives. Both of these roads lead to a conventional, complacent Culture-Protestantism from which not even social advocacy in the pulpit offers any escape. The Lutheran Church, on the contrary, does have a great tradition of prophetic preaching. But it must be reclaimed.[26]

2. *Teaching.* To say that the Lutheran Church never parted from the historic conception of a teaching church is to repeat another truism. Equally "truistic" is the observation that a hundred-fifty years of revivalism devitalized this conception and that Liberalism gave it the *coup de grace.* And here again, if self-congratulation were in order, one could point to the strong Lutheran position on catechetical instruction for youth as well as adults, the high place confirmation has in our church life, and the importance of Dogmatics in our seminaries. For this we must be thankful. But our tradition of Christian education

26 In re preaching I hope that no apology is needed for the *plea* I make; but it may be that my *judgment* of the situation is too harsh. At least the Rev. Per-Olof Sjögren of Sweden reported (in the *Lutheran Companion,* July 17, 1957) that despite bad reports of American preaching he had been "happily surprised" in his visits to Lutheran churches in this country "to have found, from so many a pulpit, preaching that is both biblical and doctrinal, really a good interpretation of the Word of God and a good translation into the modern vernacular without taking away its essence and power." Since I regard the pastors who baptized, confirmed, and installed me as a deacon to be quite exemplary, it is certain that I am not simply working off various locally built-up animosities (as was Emerson in his famous Divinity School Address, 1838). But in a decade of fairly wide traveling and sampling, the instances of superficial sermonizing unrelated to the text for the day, or any other text, have been too frequent to permit unmitigated praise.

is weak. I happen to have serious doubts if *Life Magazine* is the place to lampoon the Sunday schools, but I must nevertheless admit that Professor Wesley Shrader in his recent article spoke the essential truth. And I hope that Lutherans are fast losing their confidence that the popular conception of the Sunday school would solve the church's educational problems. We need to admit, too, that the Presbyterians and Episcopalians—more especially the latter—have stolen the march on us.

Yet there is great cause for hope in the fact that an important inter-synodical commission on Christian education has been formed, that it has these other valuable experiments as guides, and that so much in contemporary thought is making two very important facts unmistakably clear: (1) the inadequacy of Sunday school instruction which is merely a transaction between teacher and pupil alone (pastor and parent must be brought into the equation by various formal structures); and (2) the great loss to the church resulting from the complete separation of worship and education (it seems to me that the Seabury Series has performed the necessary revolution here by forthrightly making the *family service* an indispensable factor in parish education).[27]

3. *Worship.* Mention of the family service leads logically to my final point—the need to sink the foundations of our conception of divine worship below the shifting sands of nineteenth century American practice, through the still deeper sands of Pietistic experientialism and Enlightenment Rationalism—even through the dry sands of Orthodoxism's formalism—to the living rock of the Lutheran Reformation's liturgical spirit. To do this is not antiquarianism; it is rather to grasp the full meaning of evangelical reform. By such an effort we can bypass the one-sided emphasis of the medieval church and recover the worship of the early church in which pulpit *and* altar, preaching of the Word *and* the sacrament of Holy Communion, stand together in central focus. In so doing we not only renew our bond with earliest

27 The Westminster Press (Presbyterian) and Seabury Press (Episcopal) have published descriptive brochures as well as the series themselves. On the Presbyterian project see William Kennedy's remarkable Ph.D. dissertation, "The Genesis and Development of the Christian Faith Series," Yale University, 1957. Randolph C. Miller's writings on Christian education and biblical theology do much to indicate the rationale of the Seabury Series. The question of parochial schools I am leaving aside as a separate problem, though much of what is here said would apply.

New Testament times but with the first centuries of the Lutheran Reformation as well.

American ministers—especially American revivalists—have always been infatuated with the sound of their own voices. When this infatuation was coupled with an antipathy to all that was traditional, it led to a disastrously watered-down conception of worship, a type of worship that starves and parches the soul. In a more realistic sense one may point to objective damage that is done. Because sermons are often either too subtle and erudite for some, or too naive for others, they have a divisive influence which contributes directly to the scandal of America's class- and race-stratified churches.

Another potent source of this evil is the principle of congregational organization that looks to multifarious societies and clubs as the means to establish fellowship and make the church meaningful to people. If and when such circles come to predominate, not only has the means consumed the end but the "in-groups" so formed threaten to have an exclusive force that negates the church's outreach.

The reverse, and happier, side of this situation is the fact that statistics seem to show Lutheranism more successful than any other major denomination in resisting the tendency to become a church whose congregations serve only a limited range of social strata. But this is due to our doctrinal and liturgical heritage, not to any extraordinary charitableness. This tradition has constantly proclaimed that the only circle without bounds is that which God creates—the God whom we confront in the Holy Word and in whose presence we are in the church's corporate worship.[28]

At the present historical juncture the Lutheran Church can make its most important contribution to American religious life not simply by reflecting back the values and practices of its environment but by exemplifying what is deepest and best in its proper heritage. But if we are thus to bring gifts, we must first know them as our own.

28 With regard to worship, as with preaching, my impressions of "need" are based on personal observations, not statistics or questionnaires. Here, too, as I say in the concluding paragraphs, there is much cause for gratitude. Yet the need *is* great. Too few pastors seem to be generally concerned about the full meaning of the church's *leiturgia* as it can be shown forth in architecture, hymnody, liturgical order, sacramental practice, preaching, the thorough use of the Church Year, the coordination of private and corporate devotion, and the interrelation of worship and teaching. Too few congregations have been led to full participation in these treasures. I often wonder how many seminaries are doing all they should. In any event, complacency would be out of order when such depths and such riches await appropriation!

The "High Church Movement" in American Lutheranism

By David L. Scheidt

WHETHER reluctantly or not, it is time to recognize the fact that there exists within American Lutheranism an aggressive minority group variously known among its adherents as representative of the Catholic Revival, the Liturgical Movement, the Movement for Cultivating the Sacramental Life, or, most frequently, the High Church Movement. Similar minority groups have existed and still exist among Lutherans in Europe and among non-Lutherans in both Europe and America.

For some years the high church movement in American Lutheranism has been criticized as a trend toward Canterbury or Rome or as the brainchild of unstable personalities. With the exception of the critique of the Rev. Theodore Dierks in the pages of *The Confessional Lutheran,* a paper devoted to the defense of "Old Missourianism," criticism of the movement has often been restricted to its external liturgical practices. This is curious in view of the close affinity of the movement with the doctrinal formulations of the seventeenth century, not so say of "Old Missourianism." In spite of attacks, representatives of the high church movement have never attempted to present their position in a systematic way. It is therefore the purpose of this article to offer a brief and objective description of the movement's platform as this appears from the writings of its leaders.

Its adherents claim that the movement's origin is to be traced to a confessionally rooted reaction against the secularization of the Lutheran Church in America and against movements and relationships which threaten the separate existence of Lutheranism on this continent. The liturgy and the use of the so-called historical vestments and terminology of worship became the vehicles of protest for this reaction. Over the years the movement has developed a platform and program which has found expression in societies and publications.

The two most important and most widely known of the societies were the Society of St. James, embracing in its membership clergymen and laymen of the Missouri Synod and the Synodical Conference, and the Society of St. Ambrose, whose members came from the ranks of the United and American Lutheran Churches.

The Liturgical Society of St. James was founded in 1925 in Hoboken, N. J., in the Church of St. John the Baptist. It aimed at studying liturgics "with a

view to finding such forms and ceremonies as meet the requirements of decency and order and have the sanction of reliable and pure tradition."[1] The name of the society was based on the tradition that James was the author of the Jerusalem liturgy.

The policy of the society was outlined in its publication, *Pro Ecclesia Lutherana,* by its chairman, the Rev. Berthold von Schenk: "It is the purpose of the Liturgical Society of St. James to further what we now have and to bring to our appreciation our rich liturgical heritage by restoring such things as have been neglected in many parts of our church. We are bringing nothing new, nothing which is not our own possession. We are promulgating no new doctrines, nor are we denying them [sic]."[2] This society strongly opposed the conduct of public worship according to the caprice of individual pastors and claimed to aim for improvement, not uniformity. It justified its liturgical emphases for the reason that "the fostering of the liturgical life brings about the realization of participation in the Corpus Christi Mysticum, and therefore must be the destroyer of individualism."[3]

The members of the society regretted the infrequency of Communion celebrations, the non-observance of church festivals, ignorance of the Psalter and of the pericopes. This state of affairs, they maintained, contributed to a diminished consciousness of supernatural realities.[4] The society saw in the severe criticism and condemnation of its undertaking evidence of an overwhelmingly Protestant disposition of Lutheran clergymen and laymen to believe that the Lutheran Church is an offspring of the Reformation.

Since 1938 the society has been defunct. Its academic work has been carried on by the Liturgical Institute of Valparaiso University. The Order of the Blessed Sacrament appeared within recent years under the leadership of Pastor von Schenk in the New York area. Apparently it was only a local fellowship.

The second significant group, the Society of St. Ambrose, was organized in Philadelphia in November, 1932, in the Church of the Transfiguration to advance what was called "the sacramental life." This meant "to promote interest in the Divine Liturgy as the traditional expression of the Church's Corporate Worship, and to deepen the spiritual state of the Church through a Sacramental Rule of Life in Canonical Prayer, Private and Corporate."[5] The Rev. Lloyd M. Wallick summarized the society's *raison d'etre* as the "experimental practice of the liturgical life among our members."[6] The Ambrosians were of the opinion that

1 *Pro Ecclesia Lutherana,* Vol. I, No. 1, p. 1.
2 *Ibid.*
3 *Op. cit.,* Vol. II, No. 1, p. 1.
4 *Op. cit.,* p. 6.
5 From the society's Constitution. The use of capitals in this quotation is characteristic of the whole movement.
6 Wallick, L. M., "The Society of Saint Ambrose," in *The Lutheran Quarterly,* Vol. XIII (1940), p. 298.

the Communion element of the Lord's Supper had been so overemphasized as to obscure the elements of mystery, sacrifice, and thanksgiving. Therefore, the society promoted studies of "the Eucharistic Liturgy," the minor offices, the use of the so-called historic Eucharistic vestments, and the relation of the liturgy to life. Wallick tried to meet criticism by denying that the society advocated an escapist, ascetic religion and emphasizing its essential Lutheranism. Opponents of the society charged it with imitating Anglo-Catholic or High Church Episcopalians and with having secret leanings toward Rome.

The society reached its peak during the 1930's and had small but militant followings on the campuses of Hamma Divinity School, Mount Airy Seminary, and elsewhere even though seminarians were not admitted to full membership. The society held its last meeting in 1949.

Another group, the Fellowship of the Augsburg Confession, was organized in 1950 in St. Peter's Lutheran Church (ALC). The pastor loci, Ralph Edward LaFontaine, was elected dean. Its membership consisted of three clergymen and five laymen. Several Baltimore clergymen showed an initial interest in the group but soon objected to being addressed as "Father" and to the static interest in the development of forms in past centuries of Christian history. When LaFontaine resigned his Baltimore pastorate the organization collapsed completely.

After the demise of the Societies of St. James and St. Ambrose and the discontinuance of their bulletins and studies, there was no publication which could be called the organ of the high church movement. The magazine *Sursum Corda,* devoted to liturgical music, and *The American Lutheran,* a news magazine, frequently published articles by clergymen identified with the movement. Upon the retirement of the Rev. Jens Madsen, a Danish-American pastor, *Una Sancta,* the magazine which publicized the devotional life of the Ebenezer Home of which he was superintendent, became the movement's organ. This magazine has had a difficult time financially and has had to suspend publication twice in recent years. The first suspension came when its editor, the Rev. Howard Kunkle, left the ministry of the Missouri Synod (after having left the ministry of the United Lutheran Church) to become a priest of the Church of England in Canada. The second suspension came in 1953 and lasted until 1956, when the little magazine was revived.

In 1947 *Una Sancta* sponsored a literary symposium on the aims and needs of the liturgical movement. The emphasis of the symposium was on the introduction of weekly celebrations of Communion and a rethinking of the doctrines of the church and of the ministry.[7] In 1950 the staff associates published a series of statements of policy which has never been repudiated and which may be taken to be quite typical. These statements affirm that the Church of the Augsburg Confession is the true visible Church; assert that the Eucharist should be cele-

7 *Una Sancta,* St. James the Elder, 1947, pp. 5-16.

brated every Sunday and every major holy day; lament the disuse of private confession and absolution; and urge that provision be made in the Lutheran Church for "consecrating to the service of the Church of Christ those to whom God has imparted the virtue to live virgin lives—a more excellent gift according to Scripture than Holy Matrimony."[8]

Ceremonially the movement expresses itself in the celebration of "the Mass" with the use of chasuble, alb, incense, etc. There are genuflections, frequent signings of the cross, reverencing of altars, crosses, and crucifixes, and the like. Some defense of the introduction of such ceremonies has been offered by Arthur Carl Piepkorn, one of the foremost leaders and thinkers of the movement, in a study of the Lutheran Confessions. "In their concrete form," he wrote, "the Lutheran rites of the Reformation century—like the doctrinal formulations of the Reformation century—reflect the fact that the Church of the Augsburg Confession is consciously and determinedly a part of the Catholic Church of the West."[9]

Some of the Lutheran "high churchmen" insist that their movement is essentially a theological one and that the movement should therefore be defined in theological terms. The Rev. Arthur G. Marcell, provost of the former Society of St. Ambrose and a leading figure in the movement throughout his ministry, defines it this way: "By Catholic and Sacramental Life we of the High Church group mean a return to those principles of our Confessions which are laid down as the official teaching of the Church and Sacraments."[10]

According to Marcell the movement maintains that Christ established one church, which is to continue forever, and in so doing he bequeathed to the apostles and their successors, in Word and sacrament, the means of grace as they are administered in the church. Of the Lord's Supper he asserts that "high churchmen" maintain that the Lord is substantiallly present—body, blood, soul, and divinity—and communicates himself to all who eat and drink thereof. It is the visible sign of unity between Christ and his church and is the highest act of worship. Outside of the church which administers the sacraments there is no salvation. So there appears to be a tendency to elevate the sacrament above the Word of God.

Marcell cites two other planks of what can be considered the "high church platform." The first is the restoration of episcopacy as the most historic and apostolic order of government for the church. The second is the insistence that the Evangelical Lutheran Church is not a Reformation church but is part and parcel of the "Catholic Communion."

"The whole liturgical revival revolves around the church and the means of grace," according to Marcell. Consequently its emphasis is on the corporate fel-

8 *Una Sancta,* Advent, 1950, p. 3.

9 A. C. Piepkorn, *What the Symbolical Books of the Lutheran Church Have to Say about Worship and the Sacraments* (St. Louis, 1952), p. 10.

10 Private source.

lowship and common worship engaged in by those who share a common faith. "It stresses the doctrine of the Church as an organic society ministering divine life in the world, a divinely appointed and established community of believers, and an organism with a definite mission to perform through its organic life. It is the custodian of salvation, a company which has been called, gathered, enlightened, and sanctified by the Holy Ghost and which uses the means of Grace to extend the same life and faith to others. It is this lost idea which the Liturgical Movement endeavors to restore."[11] Marcell affirms that the church must be kept from unionism and from the idea that all denominations are parts of the church. The ecumenical movement and interdenominational programs of any kind represent contacts with heresy.

As Marcell sees it, the task of the church is to evangelize and to preserve. The former is the task of gathering; the latter represents "the sacramental nature of the church." Both tasks are aimed at keeping the corporate society alive and united. He stresses the corporate relationship of believers rather than dissociated experiences of single believers. To be saved one must be saved in the church, and to stay saved one must be nourished by the church through the means of grace.[12]

Marcell holds that the Reformers had no doubt whatever that their church was "*the* Catholic Church in its purity." It was the consciousness of this catholicity which directed the scholars who compiled the Common Service Book in 1888 to base it on the Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century. The protest of the Reformers was against false doctrine and a perverted hierarchical machinery which based catholicity upon men rather than the mission and message of Christ. In perpetuating its divine mission, the church continues the work of the apostles. Individual efforts or organizations which sever their connection with the apostolic and catholic church are false in teaching and practice and cannot mediate salvation.[13]

The doctrine of the ministry has never found such systematic treatment in *Una Sancta* as has the doctrine of the church. An ordination sermon which was published in the magazine, however, is a key to the movement's position. The texts of the sermon are I Tim. 4:14 and II Tim. 1:16. (The identity of the preacher was not given.) According to the sermon, the ordination service is to confer upon the ordinand, by the laying on of hands, the charismatic gifts of which the texts speak.[14] The preacher specifically denies that the "priests of the New Covenant perform a ministry of expiatory sacrifices as did their Old Testament counterparts."[15] Through ordination God gives to the ordinand a

11 Arthur G. Marcell, "The Doctrine of the Church," in *Una Sancta,* Advent, 1950, p. 7.
12 Marcell, *op. cit.,* pp. 7, 8.
13 Marcell, *op. cit.,* p. 9.
14 "The Gift That Is In Thee," in *Una Sancta,* Lutheran Martyrs of Florida, 1951, p. 9.
15 *Ibid.*

part in the Messianic mission of Jesus, so that in effect the ordained clergyman is made an *alter Christus* to men. "As a pastor you share in the kingship of the King of kings."[16]

The sermon does not state that ordination confers an indelible character. However, the idea of an indelible character found a defender in the Rev. William Baar, who affirmed that "when Luther denies that ordination confers an indelible character he is departing from a teaching that has been held since the early days of the church."[17] Baar has since left the ministry of the Lutheran Church to become an Episcopal priest.

Closely related to the doctrines of the church and the ministry is the matter of the episcopate. The movement urges its restoration as the sanest and most churchly form of government. This question is but slightly touched upon in the ordination sermon. The sermon indicates that the episcopate need not be in apostolic succession but more in the line of the German administrative episcopate. The preacher regrets the absence of a bishop at ordination services because that office is a symbol of the catholic faith and of an apostolic continuity. But he freely asserts that the episcopate, while not of the *esse* of the church, is certainly of the *bene esse*. He admits also that the office of priest and bishop originally were one and the same.[18] Among "high churchmen" there is a wide variety of opinion on the nature of the desired episcopate. Some are very outspoken in their wish for the introduction of the "episcopate in apostolic succession." Others, while not opposed to the succession, are willing to compromise for an administrative episcopate.

For the high church movement the life of the church centers around the altar and the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. The liturgy to which the movement adheres and the ceremonial which it employs are inseparably connected with this sacrament. The celebration of this sacrament is called "the Mass" and its significance is summarized this way: "He who gave Himself for me on the cross is giving Himself to me as I come to the Altar . . . that through His Living Presence and power He may do for me everything that His death has made possible for me."[19] For von Schenk this sacrament is the fulfillment of Jesus' promise. "Lo, I am with you alway. . . ." In the sacrament the Word of God proclaimed in the pulpit comes to its climax, for through the power of the Word we have the body and blood of our Lord. Thus "the ordained words added to the elements complete the sacrament by a spiritual operation."[20]

Von Schenk holds that the Holy Supper is a memorial, not of a mere past event, but the continuous remembrance as present fact of the supreme events in the life of Jesus. It is a proclamation of his death for our redemption. It is

16 *Ibid*, p. 11.
17 William Baar, "Reformation or Revolution?" in *Una Sancta, op. cit.*, p. 17.
18 Cf. also *The American Lutheran*, Vol. 19, No. 6, pp. 8, 9.
19 B. von Schenk, *The Presence*, p. 12.
20 Von Schenk, *op. cit.*, p. 12.

a thanksgiving for all the things that Christ has won for us—particularly the redemptive fact narrated in the Gospel for the day. He denies that the sacrament is a propitiatory sacrifice. Calvary was the fulfillment of all such sacrifices. "We cannot repeat the sacrifice which Jesus offered on Calvary, but in the Communion we plead this sacrifice" through the very same priest, Jesus Christ.[21] Von Schenk expresses the relation of the liturgy to the sacrament in terms of personal conviction widely shared within the movement:

> I believe that the restoration of the traditional liturgy is important. The celebration of the Eucharist should be liturgical and catholic and not a free service. It is not only poor taste but a sign of ignorance if the Canon-Eucharistic Prayer . . . is omitted. It will be a happy day when Christians again use the ancient liturgy common to the Church before the period of disintegration in the 12th century. This means a fresh understanding of the Liturgy, for a liturgy is not just a collection of prayers and other single forms of devotion, but a whole order or scheme of public worship in which all the parts are inwardly bound together by their having a common relation to the idea of a Christian altar, and by their referring themselves through this always to what must be considered the last ground of all true Christian worship, the mystical presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.[22]

To sum up this inquiry into the "high church movement" as it emerges from its fugitive literature, it appears that, in spite of variations, there are certain emphases which recur again and again and form a sort of pattern. The concern seems to be for authority and certainty, and these are related to tradition (never clearly defined) and to the external and institutional. Perhaps this accounts for the interest in rites and ceremonies, episcopacy and celibacy, quantitative aspects of devotional practice, and fixed formulations of doctrine.

21 *Ibid*, p. 18.

22 Von Schenk, *op. cit.*, p. 21. Cf. also Adolph Wismar, in *Pro Ecclesia Lutherana*, Vol. VI, No. 1, p. 9.

How Effective Is Our Public Worship?

By William E. Hulme

EACH year as my psychology of religion class reaches the subject of worship, I hear the same charges that the Lutheran service is ineffective in stimulating religious experience. "People don't really think of what they are saying." "It's always the same old thing, and so everybody just says it with everybody else." "I don't think half of the people in church know what the service is all about."

Of course, young people are naturally critical of their elders and of their elders' ways. But since this was criticism of a vital area of these young Lutherans' lives, I felt the challenge should not go unanswered.

"How do you know?" I asked.

"Well, we just know."

"This is a science course. You need a better reason than that. How can we find out scientifically?"

The result was a questionnaire, drawn up by a group of student volunteers.[1] There were many revisions before the final product emerged, and even now, with the benefit of much hindsight, we can see several ways in which it could be improved. Nonetheless, it was a start.

The questions were patterned after the format for worship in our textbook, and in general follow the order of the Common Service of the Lutheran Church. To encourage truthful answers the questions were worded in such a way that the subject would experience only a minimum of guilt in giving an uncomplimentary answer. Following is the questionnaire.

Worship Questionnaire

The service is an important part in the church life of our people. We are wondering if it is as meaningful and effective as it is intended to be. Therefore, one of the classes of Wartburg College, in connection with its study of worship, has drawn up this questionnaire to determine what the service means to people and whether or not it is producing the desired effects. As future church workers, we feel the results of this poll will be helpful. We ask your full and honest cooperation in answering the questions. Do *not* sign your name.

Check the one which refers to you:			*Age*
..... Male	..... Married	..... Below 20
..... Female	..... Single	 20-30
		 30-45
		 45-60
		..... Over 60

1 These were David Bunge, Beverly Blaisdell, James Liesner, Jackie Reents, Helen Sprenger, and Ray Venske.

1. Which of the following do you look forward to most when you attend church service?
   _____ Liturgy _____ Lord's Prayer _____ Hymns _____ Creed
   _____ Sermon _____ Reading of Scriptures _____ General Prayer

2. We realize that people attend church for various reasons. What was the main reason for your attendance today?
   _____ It is a habit _____ I wanted to worship
   _____ I wanted to please someone _____ Another reason

3. When we pray, we often do not fully concentrate on what is being said. During the prayers today, did any other things enter your mind?
   _____ Not at all _____ Part of the time _____ Much of the time

4. The Creed means different things to different people. What did the Creed mean to you as you confessed it?
   _____ A prayer for all believers
   _____ A statement of my belief _____ Has little meaning to me

5. People use private prayers at different times during the service. Check the following instances in which you use private prayer during the service.
   _____ Before the service _____ Before the offering
   _____ Before the sermon _____ After the service
   _____ Never

6. Check the main reason why you joined in singing the hymns today.
   _____ I enjoy singing _____ The hymns were meaningful
   _____ The hymns were familiar _____ They are part of the service
   _____ They are one way to praise God

7. We all can be disturbed at some time during the service. Because the amount of disturbance affects the meaning of the service, we should like to know how much you were disturbed.
   _____ Much of the time _____ Some of the time _____ Very little of the time

8. Some of us have difficulty in remembering and some of us find it hard to pay attention to what is being read. Do you still remember the message of the Gospel lesson?
   _____ Yes _____ No The Epistle lesson _____ Yes _____ No

9. Did you know that the "Create in me a clean heart, O God," etc., is meant as an offering of ourselves to God? _____ Yes _____ No

10. Have you ever had an explanation of the meaning of the service?
    _____ Yes _____ No

11. How much would the rest of the service have meant to you if the sermon would have been left out? _____ More _____ Just as much _____ Less

12. Do you think that worshiping with other believers helps you feel in closer fellowship with them? _____ Yes _____ No

Further comments (optional) _____

Our next problem was how to administer the questionnaire. Obviously it should be given as soon after the service as possible. We decided to work through the pastors of congregations where members of the class had contacts. We found them very cooperative and interested. Following the conclusion of the service the pastor either administered the questionnaire himself or introduced a member of the committee to do it. The people were informed of the purpose of the questionnaire and of the value in their information.

In this manner we polled twenty-seven churches from six midwestern states. These included urban, small town, and rural congregations. A total of 3,469 persons was polled. The questionnaire was given also to a Methodist and a Presbyterian congregation as a check.

The problem then was how to tabulate the results. This proved to be a bigger job than we had anticipated, but after several weeks of extensive work the task was completed. The results were more positive than the negatively minded had supposed, and not so positive as the more positively minded had hoped. In all of our tabulations we had to reckon with the factor of unconscious dishonesty which may have played a significant role in the answers we received.

The Results

QUESTION 1

Liturgy	[2] Av.	13 per cent	high	63 per cent	low	0 per cent
Hymns	Av.	29 per cent	high	51 per cent	low	3 per cent
Sermon	Av.	83 per cent	high	99 per cent	low	60 per cent
Main prayer	Av.	15 per cent	high	53 per cent	low	0 per cent
Lord's prayer	Av.	24 per cent	high	71 per cent	low	7 per cent
Creed	Av.	14 per cent	high	31 per cent	low	0 per cent
Scriptures	Av.	16 per cent	high	47 per cent	low	0 per cent
— No answer	[2] Av.	2 per cent	high	6 per cent	low	0 per cent

QUESTION 2

It is a habit	Av.	4 per cent	high	14 per cent	low	0 per cent
I wanted to please someone	Av.	1 per cent	high	14 per cent	low	0 per cent
I wanted to worship	Av.	93 per cent	high	100 per cent	low	87 per cent
Another reason	Av.	3 per cent	high	11 per cent	low	0 per cent
— No answer	Av.	2 per cent	high	5 per cent	low	0 per cent

QUESTION 3

Not at all	Av.	20 per cent	high	34 per cent	low	3 per cent
Part of the time	Av.	64 per cent	high	89 per cent	low	51 per cent
Much of the time	Av.	9 per cent	high	18 per cent	low	0 per cent
— No answer	Av.	6 per cent	high	16 per cent	low	0 per cent

2 Av. means average of all tested; high is congregation having highest per cent on the question; low is congregation having lowest per cent.

3 Percentages may total more than 100 per cent because several people chose more than one answer in this and other questions.

QUESTION 4

A statement of my belief	Av.	72 per cent	high	91 per cent	low	54 per cent
A prayer for all believers	Av.	26 per cent	high	54 per cent	low	8 per cent
Has little meaning to me	Av.	1 per cent	high	3 per cent	low	0 per cent
— No answer	Av.	4 per cent	high	11 per cent	low	0 per cent

QUESTION 5

Before the service	Av.	74 per cent	high	98 per cent	low	41 per cent
Before the offering	Av.	5 per cent	high	21 per cent	low	0 per cent
Before the sermon	Av.	8 per cent	high	18 per cent	low	3 per cent
After the service	Av.	51 per cent	high	94 per cent	low	8 per cent
Never	Av.	3 per cent	high	16 per cent	low	0 per cent
— No answer	Av.	7 per cent	high	31 per cent	low	0 per cent

QUESTION 6

I enjoy singing	Av.	29 per cent	high	47 per cent	low	6 per cent
The hymns were familiar	Av.	7 per cent	high	12 per cent	low	0 per cent
The hymns were meaningful	Av.	23 per cent	high	47 per cent	low	6 per cent
They are part of the service	Av.	16 per cent	high	25 per cent	low	8 per cent
They are one way to praise God	Av.	56 per cent	high	79 per cent	low	34 per cent
— No answer	Av.	4 per cent	high	12 per cent	low	0 per cent

QUESTION 7

Much of the time	Av.	4 per cent	high	12 per cent	low	0 per cent
Some of the time	Av.	28 per cent	high	50 per cent	low	14 per cent
Very little of the time	Av.	62 per cent	high	82 per cent	low	44 per cent
— No answer	Av.	5 per cent	high	16 per cent	low	0 per cent

QUESTION 8

(a) Gospel							
Yes	Av.	59 per cent	high	82 per cent	low	36 per cent
No	Av.	27 per cent	high	64 per cent	low	7 per cent
— No answer	Av.	13 per cent	high	46 per cent	low	0 per cent
(b) Epistle							
Yes	Av.	46 per cent	high	60 per cent	low	15 per cent
No	Av.	32 per cent	high	77 per cent	low	12 per cent
— No answer	Av.	23 per cent	high	41 per cent	low	0 per cent

QUESTION 9

Yes	Av.	74 per cent	high	88 per cent	low	54 per cent
No	Av.	17 per cent	high	46 per cent	low	17 per cent
— No answer	Av.	17 per cent	high	15 per cent	low	0 per cent

QUESTION 10

Yes	Av.	64 per cent	high	84 per cent	low	38 per cent
No	Av.	25 per cent	high	45 per cent	low	11 per cent
— No answer	Av.	10 per cent	high	23 per cent	low	2 per cent

QUESTION 11

More	Av.	4 per cent	high	10 per cent	low	0 per cent
Just as much	Av.	11 per cent	high	24 per cent	low	1 per cent
Less	Av.	78 per cent	high	93 per cent	low	61 per cent
— No Answer	Av.	8 per cent	high	19 per cent	low	0 per cent

QUESTION 12

Yes	Av.	91 per cent	high	98 per cent	low	84 per cent
No	Av.	3 per cent	high	7 per cent	low	0 per cent
— No answer	Av.	6 per cent	high	16 per cent	low	0 per cent

Many significant comments were received with the questionnaires, and these will be referred to in our evaluation.

Evaluation

On the average 38 per cent more women than men attended service on the day the questionnaire was given. As disproportionate as this is, the Methodist and Presbyterian congregations were even more so. Over 90 per cent more women than men attended in these churches. From these results one might conclude that the service has greater appeal to women than to men.

Question 1. As we may have expected, the sermon is the major point of interest in the service. The only influence opposing this selection so far as the questionnaire is concerned is poor preaching. The congregation that values the sermon least is also the congregation with critical comments concerning the preaching heard.

Question 2. This is one of those questions that obviously has a "proper" answer so far as Christians are concerned. It is quite likely, therefore, that giving an accepted answer was a partial motivation for the 93 per cent who said they attended church because they wanted to worship.

Question 3. As many as 64 per cent of the people admitted having some trouble concentrating on the service. Considering the fact that this is a confession of a fault, the high percentage is most revealing. It shows the problem our people have in concentrating upon worship forms. Along with this high percentage were many comments expressing dissatisfaction with the sameness or "mechanical" nature of the service.

Question 4. Because many Lutheran congregations confess the Creed as the pastor faces the altar, the idea of prayer may be associated with a confession of belief. In spite of this confusion, however, three out of four people checked the recitation of the Creed as a statement of belief.

Question 5. The most significant part of this question was the comment—almost in the form of a rebuke—that "the whole church service is prayer."

Question 6. The accepted answer, "Hymns are one way to praise God,"

receives real competition from the answer, "I enjoy singing." We see here the genuine appeal of music in itself. One out of every four comments on hymn-singing expressed irritation toward those people who do not join in the singing.

Question 7. This question is inadequate because it has no place for "not at all" in indicating the extent of one's disturbance during the service. We do not know, therefore, how many of those who marked "very little of the time" would have marked "not at all" if they had had the opportunity. The comments, however, show that disturbance is a real problem. There was more unanimity about the distraction created by noisy children and their harassed parents than about any other issue. This indicates that, at least for some people, nurseries or "cry rooms" would assist their experience of worship.

Question 8. This is an objective question. You either remember the Gospel and Epistle or you do not. But suppose you do not remember them but cannot admit it? Significantly, 23 per cent left the question unanswered for the Epistle and 13 per cent for the Gospel. In addition, 32 per cent admitted that they did not remember the Epistle and 27 per cent the Gospel.

This is compelling evidence of how difficult it is for people to grasp the message of a passage of Scripture that is read to them. There were several comments about the value in reading the lessons along with the pastor as they are printed in the hymnal.

Of more importance psychologically is the predicament that this question must have created for some people. Mrs. A., for example, may have been accustomed to giving accepted answers to religious questions. When she arrives at question 8 she has a problem. Try as she will, she cannot deceive herself into thinking she can recall what the lessons were about. Nor can she accept the condemnation that checking an uncomplimentary answer holds for her. As an escape she becomes confused and "justifiably" moves to the next question.

Question 9. The question is so worded that the reader assumes he should be able to answer yes. As in the previous question, the question created a predicament for some and they left it blank; 17 per cent had "no answer."

The questionnaire could have contained a check question at this point. The subject could have been asked whether he knew something was true when actually this "something" was false. The percentage of those who would mark the question "yes" might indicate to some extent the amount of pressure the people were under to conform.

Question 10. One out of every four is a large percentage for those who have never had an explanation of the service. The comments on this question show the desire of many for such an explanation.

Question 11. This question corresponds to the first question. The sermon is obviously indispensable for three-fourths of the people. Yet here, again, it is

poor preaching rather than good preaching that increases the value of the other worship forms for the worshiper.

Question 12. Here 91 per cent affirm the value to fellowship through worshiping together. Although the desire to say the right thing may have exerted its influence on this large majority, it may also be a testimony to the benefits experienced in corporate worship. A question even more pertinent in this area would be, "Do you think that worshiping with other believers helps you feel in closer fellowship with God?"

Further Correlations

In tabulating the results of the questionnaire, each question was graphed in terms of how each congregation answered it percentage-wise. In examining these graphs a few congregations show up consistently in their appreciation of the service and a few are more or less consistently negative.

For example, congregation *X* has the most consistently positive responses, while congregation *T* has the most negative. Both of these congregations are small in number and about the same size. Congregation *X*, however, has the highest percentage of women in all the churches—71 per cent—while *T* has a rather evenly mixed congregation.

T had the highest percentage—46 per cent—of those who did not answer question 8 regarding the Gospel and Epistle. At the same time this congregation was highest in checking "the desire to worship" motive in question 2. *T* was also low in question 10 regarding whether or not they had had an explanation of the service. Only 46 per cent said yes. Significantly *T* rates the sermon very high in both question 1 and 11 with a subsequent lowering in appreciation of other parts of the service.

Congregation *X* shows opposite tendencies. While it is high in checking the motive, "desire to worship," in question 2, it has a very low "no answer" percentage for question 8 concerning the Gospel and Epistle—3 per cent. At the same time it had the highest percentage for remembering the Gospel—82 per cent. And significantly it had the next to highest percentage in having had an explanation to the service—82 per cent. Perhaps as a result this congregation ranked highest in its appreciation of the liturgical parts of the service.

Conclusions

So far as applying our results to the worship of the Lutheran Church, our study revealed three things.

1. There is a deep appreciation on the part of many of our people for our liturgical heritage.

2. There is a definite lack, in the education of our people, of an experience of worship.

3. There is an experienced need on the part of the people for an interpretation of the service.

It would seem that a church with a liturgical pattern of worship needs to incorporate the interpretation of this worship pattern into its educational program both in the confirmation instruction of its children and in the membership classes for adults. But this instruction needs to relate itself to the dynamics of human experience, for the structure of the service serves both as a stimulus to and as an expression of the drama of religious experience that constitutes worship.

Our service has endured the test of time because it is capable of conveying the human spirit through the gamut of religious experiences in the activity of worship. But this does not happen automatically because one happens to be present in the service. Worship occurs within the soul. The forms need to be understood before they can elicit the response for which they were intended—and understood in terms of the needs and feelings of the believer as he is confronted by his Maker.

The Merger and the Confessions

By Herman A. Preus

WHEN the American Lutheran Church and the Evangelical Lutheran Church merge, whose confessional position will the merged church adopt? The ALC accepts all the Confessions of the Book of Concord together with the ancient Creeds. The ELC accepts only the Augsburg Confession and the Small Catechism, besides the three Creeds, as the official doctrinal position to which all her minsters and teachers must subscribe. Yet she recognizes the rest of the Confessions to be "in accord with these Lutheran symbols" and to be "normative for its theology" (*United Testimony*).

The question is still being asked: "Is the ALC going to step down from its confessional position to that of the ELC, or is the ELC going to step up to the ALC position?"

This issue needs clarifying before the merger is consummated. By an examination of the historical basis for the confessional position of the ELC in comparison with the ALC and the historic Church of the Reformation, this article intends to show that the ELC is situated on comparatively thin ice with respect to its confessional standard.

Let us review the situation as it stands today. The Church of Norway and her daughter, the ELC in America, accept the Unaltered Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism, along with the ancient Creeds, as their official Confessions. That does not mean that they are opposed to or in disagreement with the remainder of the Confessions in the Book of Concord (the Apology, the Smalcald Articles, Luther's Large Catechism, and the Formula of Concord).

Dr. Aasgaard has written in the Preface to the *Lutheran Hymnary*: "This position does not imply that the Evangelical Lutheran Church in any way whatsoever rejects the remaining symbolical books of the Lutheran Church, as a constant reference to them in her theological literature amply testifies, but since the other symbolical books are not known to her constituents generally, it has not been deemed necessary to require formal subscription to the entire Book of Concord."

Likewise, the *United Testimony on Faith and Life,* adopted by the merging churches, after the recognition of the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism, with the ancient Creeds, as the confessional basis of the merged church, goes on to say: "The church also receives, as further elaboration of and in accord with these Lutheran symbols, the documents in the Book of Concord of 1580, viz., The Apology, Luther's Large Catechism, the Smalcald Articles, and

the Formula of Concord; and recognizes them as normative for its theology."

On the basis of these quotations from Dr. Aasgaard and from the *United Testimony,* it is not unreasonable that some members of the ALC should ask: Must the merger be consummated at the price of lowering the confessional standards of the ALC? It would seem less painful for the ELC to add the rest of the Book of Concord to the confessional platform of the merged church than for the ALC to subtract these four Confessions from her confessional platform.

The past supports this contention. The ELC was first deprived of these four Confessions through an accident of history. It was in large measure a political accident based on theological heresy and therefore should hardly be expected to have any relevance for the ALC or the ELC for the future doctrinal development of the Lutheran Church of the world, which generally accepts the whole Book of Concord as its confessional platform.

The "accident of history" which left the ELC with only one-third of the Lutheran Confessions leaves us in a rather embarrassing position when we try to justify our present confessional basis. Of course, we have inherited this situation from the Church of Denmark-Norway. How it happened is interesting.

Shortly after Luther died, just after the middle of the sixteenth century, the so-called Crypto-Calvinist Controversy was raging in the Church of the Reformation in Germany. Luther's doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament was being threatened by Calvin's teaching, which was at variance with this. The controversy was not settled until 1580, when the Formula of Concord appeared. Here the faithful followers of Luther presented the last Lutheran Confession. The Augsburg Confession was therein reaffirmed and directed against the errors that had arisen in the Reformation Church since the death of Luther.

Crypto-Calvinism spread also to Denmark, particularly through the teaching of Niels Hemmingsen, Denmark's leading theologian and King Frederick II's intimate friend and theological counselor.

The Lutheran Reformers in Germany became alarmed at the Crypto-Calvinism in Denmark and in 1569 sent Luther's staunch friend Jacob Andreae, professor at the University of Tübingen, to Denmark to plead for Lutheran unity on the basis of the Augsburg Confession. He was given a cold reception by the king and his Calvinist counselor, Hemmingsen, and returned to Germany deeply disappointed.

Pressure from the Reformation Church in Germany finally caused Frederick to demand of all Danish-Norwegian ministers that they subscribe Luther's Small Catechism and the Augsburg Confession as the correct prophetic and apostolic teaching, binding them to preach according thereto at the risk of their lives. Frederick, however, refused to allow any of the remaining Lutheran Confessions to be admitted into the Church of Denmark-Norway.

In 1576 the Torgau Book, the basis for the later Formula of Concord, was sent to Frederick with the request that he present it to the theologians. Frederick refused. He wanted no new confession which would disturb the unity of the Danish Church and cause controversy.

The Book of Concord appeared in 1580, putting the Church of the Reformation on a solid and complete confessional basis and giving the answer to the errors and heresies that had caused so much controversy in the church. A copy of the Book of Concord was sent to Frederick II, beautifully bound in velvet and gold, and the king was asked to accept it for the Lutheran Church of Denmark-Norway. The well-known historian Tönder Nissen tells the story.

"The king, when one night he was unable to sleep, suddenly got up and asked his valet to set fire to the book—'I have found a devil which I must burn.' With his own hand he threw the book in the fire. Whether this is true is now uncertain. But it is certain that he wrote to all his bishops prohibiting the use of the book; book dealers must not introduce it under penalty of death; ministers and teachers must not have it in their possession on penalty of dismissal, 'since in this book is found that doctrine which is strange and unknown to our churches and since the unity which, praise God, these kingdoms have enjoyed could be disturbed.'"

The same story is told by Ivar Welle, dean of present church historians in Norway. The Calvinist heresy of Hemmingsen is clearly in the background of all this, and his influence had left the king and the theologians unwilling to receive the Book of Concord. Frederick was strengthened in his opposition to the Reformers by his association with Slesvig and Holstein, which also rejected the Book of Concord because it was claimed to be a disturber of the peace.

There were political reasons, too, which encouraged Frederick II in his opposition to the Confessions. He was at this time negotiating with Henry of Navarre in France and Queen Elizabeth of England, who were trying to unite all Protestant lands and rulers to fight Catholicism. The Book of Concord might disturb this united front. Nevertheless, the main reason for Frederick's rejection of the Book of Concord was undoubtedly the influence at court of the Calvinist Hemmingsen.

In the face of this history I suggest that the ELC, to further consolidate the merger, out of courtesy toward the ALC, and for the strengthening of world Lutheranism, officially accept the rest of the Confessions of the Book of Concord, namely, the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, the Smalcald Articles, the Large Catechism, and the Formula of Concord, together with our present Confessions, the Augsburg Confession, the Small Catechism, and the ancient Creeds. These are the Confessions of the Lutheran Reformation and have been the Confessions of the Church of the Reformation ever since.

Life and Thought in World Lutheranism

New Study of Luther in Finland

A doctoral dissertation on God's command in Luther, *Gottes Gebot bei Martin Luther* (Helsinki, 1956), by the young theologian Aarne Siirala, was examined in a public academic hearing at the University of Helsinki last November and proved to be the theological event of the year. In the opinion of certain Luther scholars, this study takes a preeminent position in its field.

Dr. Siirala has not beaten a beaten path harder; he has broken new ground. In the introductory lecture to his presentation he raises the question: In view of the immense literature on Luther, is there any point in pursuing Luther research? He answers by indicating the difference between extinct and live volcanos. Some results of historical research can be labeled and placed in the archives, like fossilized lava which has hardened into its final form. Luther, however, is a live volcano. From him new streams of lava continually pour out. In Luther's writings there remain materials which shatter accepted categories of interpretation and demand new formulations of basic questions.

Siirala expounds Luther's understanding of God's command with special reference to the first article of the Large Catechism. It is not an accident that Luther failed to produce a "dogmatic." The Large Catechism, which urges faith and love as God's command, is his only "dogmatic." Luther felt it contrary to the spirit of the New Covenant to write books on Christian doctrine.

Luther's writings tend rather to conceal than to reveal the mystery of human existence. Luther gives us no ready answers. In a sense he pushes us away from himself because he offers no solutions which can be mechanically repeated in meeting the burning issues of human life. For this reason it is wrong to call him a "doctrinal Father." He is constantly moving away from himself. By his use of words he does not seek to present the final truth about human existence, but rather to project before men the creative, commanding Word of God.

Siirala's main concern is the profound ethical question of discerning the good and the evil. Luther's penetration into this problem stands quite apart from both the intellectualistic (good as an objective reality to be realized through the will) and the voluntaristic (personal, experiential relation to God as will apart from structure of law) modes of thought which characterize many areas of Western Christian thought. According to Luther's insight into the nature of man's innermost problem, good is achieved neither by knowledge nor by personal decision held to as a once-for-all solution. The true dimensions of this problem reveal themselves in the forgiveness of sins, in Christ's reconciling action, by which God commands everyone to live the life of faith and of love.

God's mighty acts cannot be built into a system which helps us to master our existence. It is not given for us to flee from the state of anxiety in which we find ourselves because of our sin. By God's command we must accept it, live it out in love and faith, and help our neighbors to do likewise.

"God's command" was a key-word for Luther. In a sense it is a summary of his whole preaching activity. To offend God's command was for Luther an offense against the Gospel, against Christ himself. The biblical message as a whole is a single command of God.

Luther emphasized that the first commandment of the Decalog is the source of all other commandments. Faith, then, is nothing else than the response and the confession of the Christian to the First Commandment.

"The evil in man is his self-righteousness, the sin against the First Commandment. . . . The distinction between good and evil, between light and darkness, becomes manifest when man walks in the light of God. The right perception of God's command lies in its fulfillment; . . . sin consists of the fact that God's command has not been fulfilled" (pp. 287, 292).

"God's command does not drive men to new works but contains the demand for a new man of faith. . . . The preaching of the law is a part of the message of the resurrection of the new man in Christ. God's commandments are revealed as law and Gospel, as righteousness and grace. . . . All that Christ did is fulfillment of the command of God, and through everything that he did, he gave to men that righteousness which God's command desires" (pp. 303, 304).

God's primal command stands always in relation to his people, that is, his church. This *ecclesia* of God is a hidden reality, the body of Christ, the fulfillment of God's command. Faith and love make men "one" because in the freedom of faith they are bound to others and not to their self-chosen works. "Faith and love are God's work and Word in men. As these are, so is their God." By pointing to God Luther meant the "factor in human life which creates the good" (p. 341).

Siirala rejects the view that once Luther had broken through to an understanding of the Gospel, he spent the rest of his life sheltering it and drawing conclusions from it as different occasions required. The Luther interpreter, he insists, must show a keen sensitivity to the dialogs in which Luther was engaged throughout the Reformation controversies, Because of the dramatic nature of the struggle in which he was involved and because of uncertainty of the future, there was a deep reason why Luther wished that posterity might be aware of his witness to the Word of God particularly in the Large Catechism and *Bondage of the Will.*

Jacob W. Heikkinen

Book Reviews and Notices[1]

Biblical Archaeology. By G. Ernest Wright. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957. 288 pages. $15.

The contribution of archaeology to the understanding and interpretation of the Bible is almost incalculable, and the materials uncovered by archaeologists are becoming correspondingly extensive and complicated. Moreover, the publications of the results of the excavations of the numerous sites in the eastern Mediterranean world are either too expensive or too technical for the average student or pastor so that such books as Wright's, Albright's *Archaeology of Palestine,* Burrow's *What Mean These Stones?* Finegan's *Light From The Ancient Past,* Barrois' *Manuel d'archeologie biblique,* and *The Biblical Archaeologist* are becoming essential desk-books which must be kept within easy reach. These books deal with first-hand materials and, in so far as they list and explain the most significant archaeological discoveries, will never go out of date. That fact is to be remembered when their initial cost is considered.

We owe a vast debt of gratitude to Professor Wright for his excellent and competent treatment of the Bible from the point of view of the archaeologist. And it should be noted that he does not simply give us the dry facts of archaeology but that he brings those facts to bear on every important aspect of biblical history and theology. In the first chapter of his book, the author discusses the relationship of biblical archaeology and biblical theology, the development of the science of archaeology and the methods by which excavations are conducted and evaluated. Then he follows the various phases of the Bible story from Genesis to Revelation. Chapters II to VI deal with the period from prehistory to the end of the period of the Judges. Chapter VII is an excellent treatment of the early religion of Israel—the covenant and worship, together with Israel's experience with the customs and religion of Canaan. Chapters VIII to X are very rich in applying the results of Palestinian archaeology to the period from the foundation of the kingdom to the fall of Judah (1020-587 B.C.). There is a splendid, though necessarily circumscribed, description of the temple and its significance. Chapter XI on "Israelite Daily Life" deals with the character of agriculture, the development and character of the town, dress, and arts and crafts. Chapter XII offers an illuminating discussion of the exilic and post-exilic communities down to the end of the Hellenistic period and includes the materials from the Qumran excavations and scrolls. Chapter XIII covers the period of our Lord and Chapter XIV takes us into the Mediterranean world, the geographical matrix of the church.

The book is provided with excellent illustrations (220 of them), many of which do not appear elsewhere. Each chapter is followed by a list of suggested readings for further study—all of which are well-chosen, though there might have been additions here and there. It is to be regretted that the maps are not printed in color as in *The Westminster Historical Atlas.* There is also a series of good indices.

The reviewer finds himself in general agreement with the author though he believes that the statement that "large numbers of figurines representing the mother-goddess are found in every excavation into Israelite houses" (p. 117) needs qualification in view of Dr. Albright's observation that "It is very significant that no Astarte plaques or figurines have hitherto been discovered in any early Israelite levels in central Palestine" (*Archaeology and the Religion of Israel,* p. 114), i.e., in Iron I. Wright's statement is of course correct for Late Bronze and Iron II, and as Albright indicates such figurines may appear at any time even in Iron I. But we must be content with the facts as they appear at present. Albright's book *From the Stone Age to Christianity* is cited as *From the Old Stone Age,*

etc., on pp. 28, 39, 47, 52, 68, 97, 145, 163, 217. On p. 176, col. 2, read 597 B.C. for 759 B.C. On page 195 "ox-goad for "ox-goat," and "precious" for "previous" on page 230.

J. M. MYERS

Studies in Isaiah. By Edward J. Young. Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans Publishing Company, 1954. 206 pages. $2.50.

According to the author, this collection of articles, which appeared originally in *The Westminster Theological Journal,* "serves to acquaint the reader with recent criticism of Isaiah and to defend the New Testament interpretation of the book." Dr. Young has been a professor at Westminster Seminary since 1936.

The first three chapters are a survey of the literature on Isaiah since the appearance of the commentary of Joseph Addison Alexander in 1946, a work which Young considers "exemplary." Attention is given to the various phases through which the study of Isaiah has passed, with special emphasis on the contributions of Delitzsch, Dhum, Gunkel, and Torrey. The survey is of real value, perhaps precisely because the literature is seen and evaluated from an extreme fundamentalist position. Very interesting is the attempt to disassociate Delitzsch from his own mature critical position in order, apparently, to save him for the "evangelical" camp.

Referring back to Alexander, Young concludes his survey of the material by observing that "the scholarly world has practically ignored its greatest commentary on the evangelical prophet" and calls for the reissuance of Alexander's work and the creation of a new commentary along Alexander's lines—a commentary that would "turn the hearts of men . . . from the vagaries of vain speculation." Dr. Young repeatedly asserts that the New Testament teaches the unity and Isaianic authorship of the entire book, and he frequently bolsters his own position and interpretations by such phrases as "the Christian believes" and "from the Christian point of view."

The next two chapters deal with the Suffering Servant in Isaiah. Young discusses Eissfeldt's attempt to identify the Servant with the "ideal people" in distinction from the actual people, and, more at length, Sellin's claim that the martyr Servant is Deutero-Isaiah himself and that Is. 52:13-53:12 was written by Trito-Isaiah. Young advances some cogent reasons why these interpretations must be regarded as untenable. He himself feels that the four servant songs present no problem once it is recognized that the Servant of whom the prophet speaks is none other than "a corporate Person, Jesus Christ as the Head of His Church."

Young next examines the claim that the myth of the dying and rising god, particularly as set forth in the Ras Shamra texts, may have been a source of the "Suffering Servant idea." He discounts this—probably rightly—but seems to labor under the misconception that divine revelation of a truth would preclude any antecedents of it in the thought-life of man.

Two chapters are devoted to the Immanuel Prophecy. The endeavor here is to prove that Is. 7:14 contains a direct prediction of the virgin birth of Christ. This is the position of "those who regard the New Testament as divinely inspired." (The question might be raised as to why our Lord was named Jesus and not Immanuel if Is. 7:14 is a direct and exclusive prediction relating to Christ's birth.)

A careful and detailed exegesis of the passage follows. It is surprising, in view of Young's insistence that "we must be guided . . . only by the text itself." to find him stating dogmatically that it was "in a vision" that the prophet saw the virgin. As might be expected, considerable space is devoted to the discussion of the Hebrew word *'almah.* Young asserts that neither in the Old Testament nor in the Ras Shamra tablets is it ever used of a *married* woman, and leaves the impression, not born out by Ras Shamra, that this is equivalent to virginity. Furthermore, he acknowledges that twice in the Ras Shamra texts, announcements that an *'almah* will bring forth a son may not refer to a virgin birth but simply predict that the virgin, after her marriage, will bear a son. He does not seem to see that this may be precisely the force of the announcement in Is. 7:14.

A number of recent interpretations of the Immanuel passage are discussed. All are

found wanting. At the close he also rejects the interpretation advanced by LaSor and many other "believing scholars" that the prophecy had an immediate fulfillment in a child born of a young married woman but its deepest and ultimate fulfillment in the virgin birth of Jesus Christ. Young regards v. 14 as a direct prediction of the supernatural birth of Christ. He admits, however, that the same cannot be said of v. 15. It "pictures the Messiah as subsisting upon a most unusual diet," and Young holds that this cannot be "predictive prophecy" since Christ did not eat butter and honey in his infancy. It must therefore be regarded as simply symbolic of events to take place in Ahaz' time. It is surprising how little difficulty this interpretation seems to cause Dr. Young.

The final chapter deals with the word translated "sprinkle" in the King James version of Is. 52:13. Young prefers this rendering to more recent suggestions, and sees in the term a reference to the priestly and purificatory work of the Servant.

The book is supplied with extensive and informative footnotes, many of these being quotations in foreign languages, chiefly German. An index would have added to the usefulness of the work.

JOHN STENSVAAG

Hebrew Man: How he Looked, Lived, and Thought. By Ludwig Köhler. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. 160 pages. $2.50.

The retired Zurich professor attempts in this book to "present the Hebrew in all the various aspects of his physical and spiritual life." He answers such questions as, What did Hebrew men and women look like, what was the routine of their daily life, how were the individual and the community related, what was the inner life and mentality of the Hebrew?

There are many fine insights in this book which will help to make the every-day life of the ancient Hebrews real to the Bible reader. Many points are treated that are rarely illumined in other works. The place of the father in the education of his children; the common people as speakers in the "town meeting"; giving a meaningful name to a child; the *sod* or community circle after the evening meal—these and many other details of the daily life of the common people come to light in this book. There is a fine treatment on the Hebrew mentality—its passion, sensitivity, and the polarity between the mass emotion and the individual independence of thought. One of the best sections is concerned with "Justice in the Gate," the place of the law in daily community life.

The book is readable and geared to the lay student of the Bible. Some parts are too sketchy, and from time to time there are conclusions based upon inadequate data. The statement that the leprosy of the Bible is *not* the disease known by that name today (p. 49 f.) requires more evidence than is given. When the author cites Num. 14:29-33, the judgment that the rebellious generation would die in the wilderness, as a datum on the short life span of the ancient Hebrews, he not only overlooks the special character of the judgment God pronounced, but he also misapplies the figures (p. 39). These occasional limitations should not obscure the biblical scholarship and understanding of sociological factors revealed in the book.

The work is well translated and printed, but in two places, at least, the proof-reader was nodding. On page 67 "unclean" should be "unclear." And on page 62 the son of Jonathan is called "Meribaal." This should be "Merib-baal" (two words in Hebrew), and he is the grandson of Saul, the king, and not of Paul, as stated!

ETHAN MENGERS

The Text of the Old Testament. By Ernst Würthwein. Translated by Peter R. Ackroyd. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1957. 173 pages.

The purpose of this book is twofold: to present a brief introduction to the problems of textual criticism in relation to the Old Testament, and to familiarize the student with the critical apparatus in the 3rd edition of Kittel's *Biblica Hebraica.* The author speaks of his work as "a supplement to Biblica Hebraica." He is concerned to explain the symbols used in textual study so that the student may recognize the witnesses to the text to which reference is made; but he is also concerned to evaluate

the witnesses themselves so that the student can know which bear the greater weight in determining the text of a disputed passage. The discussion includes the Masoretic text and also the more significant versions. In Ch. IV the author gives a brief but helpful presentation of the aims and methods of textual criticism and of the causes of textual corruption. The last half of the book includes 41 plates of ancient inscriptions and manuscripts with a brief explanation of each. Though the book is written primarily for the Hebrew student, the language is sufficiently non-technical so that anyone interested in "the history, the characteristics, and the problems of the various witnesses to the text" can read it and profit by the reading. The author contends, and rightly so, that textual criticism has real theological significance. Our concern to discover as accurately as possible the original form of the Old Testament record is "because we wish to be confronted with the Word itself, and not merely with that which fallible men have made of it in the process of transmission." An acquaintance with textual criticism should help anyone to read the Bible in translation with greater intelligence but with undiminished confidence.

J. P. Milton

Jesus Christ the Risen Lord. By Floyd V. Filson. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. 288 pages. $4.

The last decade has seen a rash of New Testament theologies, in number unparalleled since the period before Liberalism at the turn of the century. One of the best, perhaps the most helpful to pastors and all other students of theology in America, is this volume by the professor of New Testament and dean at Chicago's McCormick Theological Seminary. Presbyterian Filson is especially qualified for the task since he has translated for the English-reading audience such significant European scholars as Rudolph Otto and Oscar Cullmann and written widely in his own right on biblical theology.

His book offers a formal, fuller presentation of the thesis propounded in an earlier monograph, *The New Testament Against Its Environment* (London: SCM Press, 1950), namely, that in biblical thought there is "a unity centered in God and in his working in Israel and Christ and the church" (p. 22), i.e., *Heilsgeschichte.* That thesis forms the heart of the eight presuppositions which Filson frankly states at the outset of this essay in biblical theology. He assumes God as the central axiom and actor; his redemptive work in history; a place for the human factor; emphasis upon the setting in the church; existence of the canon; the aforementioned idea of unity; a central place for the Christian gospel; and, above all, the interpreting role of the resurrection.

This choice, of the resurrection of Jesus as the "starting point and interpreting clue" for biblical theology, is Filson's especial contribution and shapes his entire thought. Admittedly, one might begin with an analysis of man's need or the existence of God, the Incarnation or the ministry and teaching of Jesus; but all these are rejected on New Testament grounds. Likewise rejected, startlingly, is the cross as an organized theme (though receiving due emphasis in a later chapter on "Christ and the Cross"), since "none of the New Testament thinking was centered in the Cross" (p. 28) but rather, Filson contends, on a *new* fact that interprets the cross, the resurrection of Jesus. The case of Saul-become-Paul is clearest evidence that not cross but resurrection is the key. And if this approach seems to borrow trouble in apologetics, it does make central what really counts and results in a biblical theology that is "essentially the message of Jesus Christ, the risen Lord of his church" (p. 30).

Throughout, the chapters relate varied areas of New Testament thought to this central theme. Opinions are generally conservative (e.g., Ephesians is regarded as Pauline), and the views of current New Testament investigation accurately reflected, as on the *kerygma* or eschatology, though not uncritically (thus we are reminded not to overdo distinctions between *kerygma* and *didache;* every apostolic preacher was also a teacher, and vice versa). Organization of each chapter is clear, and notes helpfully suggest further readings. Especially welcome are stresses upon the life and teachings of Jesus, his exaltation as effective and active Lord (rather than upon any Ascension-

departure that may lead to the "big vacation after Easter" heresy in church life), and thus the continuing work of Christ through his Spirit in the church. The approach is happily slanted toward the preacher in the parish and his needs.

In so large a survey a few points are always open to differing interpretations. The prophets of I Peter 1: 10 f., identified on p. 158 as Old Testament figures, may well have been *Christian* prophets; so E. G. Selwyn has argued, and the apparent identification as Old Testament writers is the more unfortunate when Selwyn's commentary is cited at the end of the paragraph as if he endorsed all the details in the section. On p. 175 it is stated: "The initial conversion and renewal of the Christian are the work of the Holy Spirit. At first, to judge from the earliest records, this fact was not clearly recognized. The act of faith was prominent." Here, perhaps, Filson writes with the Synoptics in mind, but he might add, to the list of verses that follows, the passage at I Cor. 12:3, where Paul holds that the fundamental confession of the lordship of Christ by the individual believer within the fellowship comes only from the Spirit (cf. p. 167), making the Spirit the *sine qua non* for belief and confession.

Gal. 3:16, Paul's famous exegesis of Gen. 12:7, "and to thy seed," as a reference to Christ, is included on p. 88 as an example of "strained interpretation," "mechanical" fulfillment of prophecy. Perhaps. But Paul knew enough Hebrew to realize that "seed" is a collective in the Genesis passage (as Filson points out), and it is possible that we ought to explain his interpretation neither as bad grammar nor strained literalism, but as a case of the theological type of thinking the New Testament shows elsewhere, reflecting the idea of recapitulation, stressed, e.g., by Cullmann: the notion that out of the many in the Old Testament Israel comes the remnant and finally the One, from whom, the true Israel, stems in turn the New Remnant and New Israel and eventually the many for whom Christ died. H. H. Rowley, at least, once responded that this interpretation is quite likely here, and Burton's comment in the ICC *Galatians* (p. 182), that Christ here represents "the head of a spiritual race," and the observation in the new Bauer-Arndt-Gingrich *Lexicon* (col. 769a), that a few Septuagint verses use *sperma* with reference to "a single individual . . . as the representative of all the descendants," make such a *heilsgeschichtliche* interpretation worth considering.

A few errors appear in an otherwise handsome specimen of the bookmaking art: on p. 44 Rudolph Bultmann should be spelled "Rudolf" to conform to usage elsewhere; and on p. 52, point "5" in the outline of the apostolic preaching should presumably be "4" since there is no apparent omission of any material.

Comparisons with other recent New Testament theologies are perhaps inevitable. This book is not so controversially stimulating as the epigrammatic and apocalyptic Stauffer or the more tedious, existentialistic Bultmann, but far more relevant for most readers, one suspects. It seems superior in balance and is more up-to-date than F. C. Grant's *An Introduction to New Testament Thought* (1950), and less individualistic in structure than John Wick Bowman's *Prophetic Realism and the Gospel* (1955). It stands as a convenient and reliable statement of commonly prevailing scholarly thought today about New Testament theology, clearly stated, and practical in tone.

JOHN REUMANN

Christ and the Modern Opportunity. By Charles E. Raven. Greenwich: Seabury Press, 1956. 88 pages. $2.25.

This book contains five addresses and a sermon delivered by Canon Raven, chaplain to Queen Elizabeth, at McGill University, Montreal, in 1955.

The old, yet ever new, subject of the relationship between Christ and life is difficult to speak about both because there is really nothing essentially new to say and because it is so easy to say what has already been said in a trite and dull manner. The first chapter of this book lets the reader think that this may be the same old thing said in the same old way. At page 20 one is tempted to lay the book down with the comment, "I've read all that a thousand times." But then a glance at page 21 reveals the title of the second chapter, "Christ in a World of Science,"

and there is enough curiosity in most of us to be lured by that title into finding out what this man has to say about that area of time-worn tension which is still good for another turn. And this is well, because from here on the author says many of the same old things, to be sure, but he certainly does not say them in the same old way. With keen insight and simple, direct logic he fascinates the reader with his fresh manner of speaking of those things which trouble and sometimes undermine the faith of students and teachers. In lucid, sparkling style he applies the Gospel to life. Samples read like this: "I believe that the only freedom is when we are at liberty to follow the highest in fellowship with our neighbors and in the service of God" (p. 42). "The most astonishing thing perhaps in the New Testament is that Jesus sent out his disciples, the twelve and the seventy, to serve, to proclaim the Good News before they had even properly understood it themselves" (p. 57). "I suppose that more young people are ruined by sheer careerism than by anything else in the world" (p. 58). "You don't achieve fellowship by sitting around a table and feeling 'fellowly.' It is given to you in the doing of the work" (p. 81).

Raven preaches as he lectures. But it is the kind of preaching which wins and holds the attention of a student community. In a positive, open manner he suggests practical applications of the Gospel to life, especially in the areas of the relationship between the Christian and his intellectual work and between the individual and the community in Christian living.

SIDNEY RAND

Jesus' Belief in Man. By Edwin McNeill Poteat. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. 159 pages. $2.50.

One of Dr. Poteat's last books before his death, this is sub-titled "What Christ taught about human nature." He seems in his introduction to be stressing the identity of Jesus with man while not denying the relation of Jesus with God. "Jesus expressed his identification with God in the works he did. . . . This is not to be taken as blessing the uniqueness of Jesus' incarnational relation to God, but as a sharper focus on the identification which Jesus made between himself and his friends."

The intent is to construct a "biblical doctrine of man" which "needs to be restated in an age when cynicism and pessimism have soured and swallowed it." The abundant use of the words and actions of Jesus should certainly qualify the book as "biblical." Each section is selected to show how Jesus was able to see "good" in man in each of his encounters with them.

The book is most appealing. The author's wealth of vacabulary and sense of the dramatic combine to hold the reader fast. He is held even firmer perhaps by his innate desire to see himself in this flattering mirror.

Poteat places himself consciously against the mainstream of theological thought. He gives us an object lesson in how a point of view can be read into the Bible rather than letting the Bible as a whole speak to us. The point of view is quite clear: Jesus' acts and words are to be taken quite literally while Paul's writings, for example, are apt to "bespeak less his good judgment than his ill health." He is utterly convinced of man's goodness and every act or word of Jesus is turned to support this. When Jesus uses the words "When you fast," "we are struck by the fact that Jesus saw in man a capacity to discipline himself." When the woman at Jacob's well is joyous it is "hard to account for her enthusiasm" except that Jesus "had told her some *good* thing she had done."

There is indeed a great deal of truth in the potential goodness which Jesus took for granted in men. The question is whether this goodness is simply innate in men and is to be evoked by exhortation and example, or whether the goodness is perverted and needs repentance, forgiveness, and renewal. Poteat stands with the former. The historic Christian faith stands with Paul, who saw the potential fulfilled only after the *therefore* of Christ's redemptive event.

OTTO A. BREMER

Body and Soul. By D. R. G. Owen, Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1956. 239 pages. $3.75.

This book is "A Study on the Christian View of Man" and as such is a significant contribution to this area of concern. It clearly

and, to my mind, conclusively musters the evidence against the body-soul dualism still prevalent in most of Christianity today. It shows how the findings of science, while refuting a body-soul dualism, actually, by treating man as a psychosomatic unity, support the biblical view, which clearly regards man in his totality as the creature of God.

After making an initial plea for a proper synthesis of the assured findings of modern science with Christian faith, Dr. Owen goes on to describe what he calls the "religious" anthropology, of a body-soul dualism, as found in all the more developed non-Christian religions of the world. Then he traces the influence of this "religious" view on early and medieval Christian thought and how it fared in the Reformation and modern thought. The result in Christianity, Catholic as well as Protestant, was the acceptance of a body-soul dualism replacing the original unity of man as witnessed to in the Bible. In philosophy it resulted either in a completely materialistic view (Hobbes) or a complete dualism (Descartes) or complete idealism (Berkeley, etc.). To Spinoza's consistent monism was added Kant's peculiar version of dualism. The problem was how to salvage the freedom of man in a world of strict causation, and the problem remained unsolved.

Then Dr. Owen goes on to describe the modern "scientific" view of man, as based on the findings of biology, the social sciences, and psychology, which conclusively refute the "religious" anthropology. This led, however, to a one-sided "scientific naturalism" which made the error of supposing the scientific method to be the only avenue to truth and also committed the reductionist fallacy and so ended up with a "one-level materialism," "absolute determinism," and "complete moral relativism." This was by way of contrast to the "body-soul dualism" and the "libertarianism" and "absolute moralism" that had come to prevail in Protestantism generally. Both of these views are to be rejected.

Dr. Owen goes on to develop the meaning of "spirit," viz., man as a psychosomatic unity, a creature *sui generis*, a subject and not an object, a person possessed of self-consciousness and self-determination (individuality and responsibility), a part of nature and yet transcending it, a trichotomy of the physical, the socio-psychological, and the spiritual, but, as such, a unity, This is the scientifically based anthropology which Dr. Owen finds in harmony with the biblical view of man, which he describes in the third part. He discusses "the biblical attitude to the physical" as created good and destined for fulfillment. He reviews the use of the words for "body" (*sarx, soma*) and "soul" (*pneuma, psyche*) in the Bible and shows how this excludes the "religious" body-soul dualism.

In a final chapter on "The Nature and Destiny of Man" he shows how, according to the biblical witness, man, who was created good, nevertheless is a sinner in as much as his self-consciousness immediately made its appearance as self-centeredness and his freedom of will appeared as self-will (original sin). There is thus no historical *status integritatis*, but man's history begins with the "fall." By the encounter with God in Christ man is redeemed from his self-centeredness and given true freedom in the realization of all the potentialities of his nature under the lordship of Christ. This freedom is partial now but will be fully realized in the resurrection of the dead and a new heaven and a new earth in which the whole creation is to share. There is on this view no intermediate state, but any time interval between death and the fulfillment is to be disregarded.

This book is to be highly recommended for its clear and well-documented recapitulation of what a whole line of scholars has established as the biblical anthropology. This anthropology, as Dr. Owen would be the first to admit, is no discovery of his own. Nor are men like Brunner (*Man in Revolt*) and Niebuhr (*Human Nature and Destiny*) alone to be given credit. The spade work was done by H. Wheeler Robinson and others at the beginning of this century. Karl Heim, Carl Stange, Werner Elert, Paul Althaus, and others also anticipated these views. It is significant, furthermore, that it is Calvin rather than Luther who is responsible for the repressionistic ethics of Protestantism. Luther's anthropology (cf. M. A. H. Stomps, *Die Anthropologie Martin Luthers,*

1935) was not at all like the scholastic anthropology to which later Lutherans returned. There is nothing in Luther's anthropology to contradict Dr. Owen's conclusions. At any rate, defenders of Lutheran Orthodoxism today, who regard the denial of the immortality of the soul and of an intermediate state as heretical, will be hard-pressed to prove their case. The witness of the Bible is unquestionably against them. There is just concern that a few brilliant, determined, scholastically minded individuals, fearful of what is derisively called "existentialist heresy," will take over the altogether human, earthy, biblical Luther.

Dr. Owen's peculiar contribution lies in the case he makes for a synthesis of the scientific and the biblical view. It is surprising that he did not make more of the substitution in modern physics of relations for substances. This would have strengthened his case. It is surprising also that in his analysis of the self and of original sin there is no mention of Kierkegaard, whose contributions in this area have been so significant. There is also perhaps a little too much optimism about the greater freedom the modern scientific developments give man. Undoubtedly God has something to do with these developments, and they are replete with possibilities for good as well as for evil, but to call them redemptive does violence to the distinction between law and Gospel. Whatever they may do, they cannot redeem the sinner, and Dr. Owen is, no doubt, well aware of this. Nevertheless, there is good reason for stressing, as Dr. Owen does, the greater possibilities for the realization of potentialities which scientific developments open up. In many instances the natural sciences must do their work before the person can be reached by the Gospel. In this broad sense they then work "redemptively." What Luther called God's left-hand rule is by all means *his* rule, and there is, properly understood, also a "grace" of nature which must be distinguished from, but not divorced from, the "grace of our Lord Jesus Christ."

What Dr. Owen has to say about "God as Spirit" (Appendix to Chapter VII, pp. 157 f.) does arouse, as he anticipated, some criticism, but not only from defenders of a crude supernaturalism, but also from defenders of a neo-supernaturalism. This kind of description of God justifies Karl Barth's fears of the *analogia entis* (see e.g. his "The Doctrine of the Word of God, pp. 383 ff.). It is better to speak of the "hidden" God—better also to allow God's hidden presence in the "masks" of creation, to use Luther's term, without making the relation between God and the "created" world analogous to "man's relationship to nature and the material basis of his existence" (p. 158). For man the material basis of his existence is necessary to his being; God, on the other hand, is the ground of all being and in no way dependent upon his creation.

MARTIN J. HEINECKEN

God's Way with Man. By Roger Hazelton. Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1956. 204 pages. $3.

Roger Hazelton has been professor of Christian theology at Andover Newton Theological Seminary since 1945. He is the author of several books and articles and has been active in the ecumenical movement. His writings are characterized by an almost equal interest in systematic and philosophical themes and by a luxuriant, sometimes tortuous style, rich in concrete imagery. It might be fair to say that his contribution is being made to the area of philosophical theology or Christian metaphysics. He contends for the faith by developing the historic themes of systematic theology in the light of current philosophical alternatives and objections.

The present volume was written in the conviction that the doctrine of providence has not received from present-day theologians the attention it deserves. Yet this doctrine is of crucial importance today because the time-honored trust in divine guidance and protection has suffered heavily in the general collapse of structured Christian faith and life. The affirmations of the doctrine of providence have become questions in our day. Is God in actual control of human destiny? Does he take anything like a personal interest in the course of events? Does he support our striving after good in the face of so much that is evil in the world we have to live in?

Hazelton feels that the treatment of providence most needed at the present time is an approach which comes at the doctrine not systematically, but strategically, by trying to see God at work in just those experiences from which he seems to be evacuated. He writes: "If we are going to reconstitute the idiom and the idea of Providence in our time, we must first identify ourselves with them in those very situations of lostness, dread, or emptiness where the thought of a guiding, guarding, governing God is being sharply questioned." It is clear that Hazelton's thought and language are deeply influenced by the existentialist movement, and it is likely that this is the most appropriate stance from which to vindicate the doctrine of providence. Yet, the author uses existentialist themes for the purposes of diagnosis and illumination and draws upon the classic patristic, medieval, and Reformation positions for his constructive work. Despite the existentialist cast or flavor of the entire book, Hazelton is sharply critical of certain aspects of that school of thought and actually endorses a Christian Platonism which disagrees at important points with Plato. In other words, this is a genuinely dialectical piece of work.

The most impressive chapters are the first six, in which the author analyzes the human situation in terms of the questions raised about destiny, fate, freedom, time, eternity, and the tragic. In each case he describes the form which the question takes and draws heavily upon the so-called *avant-garde* writers and thinkers in order to draw tight the knot of the human predicament. Then he attempts to disentangle, in the light of the historical as well as the contemporary formulations of Christian doctrine, the proper and helpful Christian emphasis from the misunderstandings and distortions which make providence seem incredible or irrelevant. Finally, he explains how the doctrine of providence is the only solution to the human problem as he has restated it.

Hazelton's dialectic is effective, especially in pointing to the paradoxical way in which the common denials of providence are actually unintended affirmations of this doctrine. Scattered throughout the book are fruitful and brilliantly-phrased insights in the areas of systematic, biblical, historical, and philosophical theology. The book is notable for the close tie which Hazelton maintains between the evangelical experience of living in and by God's grace and the theological articulation of this experience. This is a rich book, and it deserves careful attention. It raises the agonizing questions of our generation and sketches out the sort of answers with which systematic theologians and preachers must concern themselves.

HAROLD H. DITMANSON

Natural Religion and Christian Theology. By A. Victor Murray. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1956. 168 pages. $3.50.

Murray is president of Chestnut College at Cambridge and author of several books on theology and religious education. This book was written in the belief that a new approach to theology is necessary. The author holds that the classical Roman and Protestant orthodoxies depend upon metaphysics. Liberal theology depends upon history. And the most vigorous forms of contemporary theology, those which draw upon Barth, the Reformers, and existentialist insights, are based upon an illegitimate and unworthy denigration of human nature. Murray proposes that a fresh and profitable approach to theology must operate from the voluminous data provided by the sciences of psychology and anthropology.

The author argues that there are three basic sources of our knowledge of God—nature, morality, and interpersonal relationships. These sources are common to man as he is, whatever his epoch or faith. All men are born with an awareness of an unseen world, and theology is man's explanation of the phenomena that are associated with this unseen world. The only way of giving character to the unseen presence is by projecting upon it qualities with which we are already familiar from common experience. Thus the leading characteristics of Christianity are rooted in natural religion. The bulk of this book consists of a description of the quarry from which the metaphors to be used in analogical predication are to be taken. Murray recognizes that any discussion of natural religion is bound to run

the risk of arriving at Matthew Tindal's position, i.e., that Christianity is a republication of the religion of nature. The question of the finality of Christianity arises at this point, for one must ask in what sense any schematic interpretation of psychology and anthropology can be said to be "final." Murray tackles this question by describing the effect of the Gospel upon natural religion. On any reasonable interpretation, the astonishing impact of Jesus Christ on men has yielded psychological, social, and philosophical advantages that cannot be matched anywhere else. Christ satisfies the fundamental and universal needs of man. Thus, within the church natural religion has ceased to be.

Murray writes with the learning, clarity, and grace that one expects of a British theologian. Within his book many individual subjects are treated most helpfully and suggestively, and his work is a worthy contribution to apologetics. The book does, however, have its defects. It will appear to those who are struggling with the problems of exegetical and systematic theology that the author is an unreconstructed Liberal who is out of touch with the main development of theology since 1920, although he does ask the perplexing questions about theological method and the relation of theology to culture which it has always been the mission of Liberalism to raise.

HAROLD H. DITMANSON

The Virgin Mary, the Roman Catholic Marian Doctrine. By Giovanni Miegge. Translated from the Italian by Waldo Smith. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1955. 196 pages. $3.50.

In the opinion of this reviewer, this is a book that can be read with profit by Protestant and Roman Catholic alike. While exposing the non-Scriptural character of the present Marian trends in Roman Catholicism, it is certainly not of the popular tub-thumping variety; nor is it akin to the secularist criticism propounded by a Blanshard. Professor Miegge's standpoint is definitely that of orthodox supernaturalist Protestantism. The treatment is historical and doctrinal rather than psychological. That the latter is not emphasized may be a defect; but it was probably not a part of the author's objective. A brief treatise cannot be encyclopedic; but psychological considerations would enlighten considerably our understanding of the historical process.

The foreword by Dr. Mackay could well have been omitted; it adds nothing to the discussion of the subject and appears unduly optimistic about the doctrinal status of contemporary Protestantism, which sorely needs to set its own house in order.

The translator's preface stresses a matter often overlooked. "Every branch of the Christian church has the responsibility to try to understand the faith of other communions in the Christian fellowship. . . . In the interest of Christian unity it may be possible for us to be more hospitable to some systematic honoring of her [Mary] as mother of Christ" (p. 10). It might be added that had the Lutheran Church been faithful to its own tradition, this would have been done.

The chapter on "Mary in the Gospel" deals with the mother of our Lord in the New Testament narratives. The comment that the Gospels are testimonies rather than biographies or history reflects a contemporary philosophical trend that can have doctrinally disastrous results. To be sure, the sacred writings are testimonies, but as such they are based on historical data, not on figments of the imagination. The conclusion, however, that Mary is not only a witness but "a chosen instrument of the incarnation" can well be underscored.

The succeeding chapters on the Eternal Virgin, the Mother of God, the Queen of Heaven, the Assumption, the Immaculate, and the Compassionate Mother speak for themselves and need not be commented on in detail. The gradual evolution of Mariolatry is carefully traced. The incompatibility of the present status of the Virgin (according to Roman Catholicism) with the teachings of the ancient Fathers and the leading scholastics is clearly shown. Adopting the methods of the admittedly questionable Modernism, the 20th century Roman Church has affirmed what the medieval establishment would not do. Analogical reasoning, never a safe guide in itself, has led to fearful conclusions.

The chapter on the Co-redemptress shows

how the idea implicit in this term is inconsistent even with the pronouncements of Pius X and Benedict XV. Another observation is worthy of note. "The second century church rejected without hesitation the gnostic speculations on the female principle in redemption as a heresy derived from pagan ideas. It seems a fateful thing that Mariology is introducing into the church again, in attenuated form, many elements of the heresies the church condemned in other times" (p. 172).

The concluding chapter on Mary in Dogma and Devotion is excellent and should be read very carefully. Some of the author's observations, of course, are not new; they remind one of Henry Adams' chapter on the Virgin in *Mont St. Michel and Chartres.* But when he speaks of the official worship of the Roman Church as contrasted with that of the people, he is calling our attention to something highly significant.

A. C. M. AHLÉN

Advocates of Reform, from Wyclif to Erasmus. Edited by Matthew Spinka. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953. 399 pages. $5.

In presenting selections from the writings of churchmen who advocated reform from about 1350 to the early years of the Reformation, this fourteenth volume of the Library of Christian Classics supplies a provocative sequence of source materials. While reaction to the scholasticism of St. Thomas may be studied in the nominalism of men like William of Ockham—with its emphasis on revelation in matters of Christian faith—a more dynamic and dramatic reactionary strain emerges in such radicals as Wyclif and Hus, and in such moderates as the Conciliarists and Erasmus.

From this strain Matthew Spinka has drawn typical selections, each provided with a generally satisfactory introduction. There is John Wyclif's treatise "On the Pastoral Office" (c1378) and "On the Eucharist" (c1380), but not his better known and highly instructive work "On Divine Lordship," from which, as he points out, all civil dominion is derived. There is John Hus's tract "On Simony" (1413), here translated for the first time, but not his more familiar treatise "On the Church."

The selection from the predominantly German champions of the conciliar movement includes Henry of Langenstein's "Letter on Behalf of a Council of Peace" (1381); John Gerson's tract "On the Unity of the Church" (c1409); Dietrich of Niem's "Ways of Uniting and Reforming the Church" (1410); and John Major's much later "Disputation on the Authority of a Council" (1529). Other possible selections, like Peter d'Ailly's "Tract on the Reformation of the Church," done for the Council of Constance, would have been welcome. Yet Spinka indicates that the d'Ailly tract borrows heavily from Henry of Langenstein.

While Wyclif and Hus appealed to the Scriptures as their final authority, and the more moderate conciliarists advocated "institutional and moral reforms without getting involved in a radical contradiction of the current scholastic theology," Erasmus chose a middle ground. Temperamentally he was akin to the conciliarists, yet his scholarly work laid the basis for a new exaltation of scriptural authority by his publication of the Greek New Testament text. Nothing of this, quite naturally, is included here; nor is Erasmus's provocative treatise on "The Freedom of the Will" which proved so fruitfully irritating to Luther. Instead, "The Enchiridion"—a handbook of the Christian philosophy—was chosen "because it represents more of the characteristic traits of Erasmus' conception of Christianity than any of his other works."

Professor Spinka's biographical sketches of Wyclif and Erasmus, and of his obvious favorite, Hus, are a helpful preface to each new section. The translation of each selection is fresh and, so far as this reviewer is able to judge, faithful to the often exasperating Latin originals. Special recognition is in order not only for the linguistically gifted Matthew Spinka but also for his two able associates in this enterprise, Ford Lewis Battles and James Kerr Cameron.

E. THEODORE BACHMANN

The Great Tradition of the American Churches. By Winthrop S. Hudson. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1953. 282 pages. $3.75.

In summarizing the argument of this book, Winthrop Hudson concludes, "The separa-

tion of church and state will be the best thing for both the churches and the nation in the twentieth century if the responsibilities . . . [that such separation] defines are freely acknowledged and the necessary reconstruction in the life of the churches takes place." By their separation from the state, the responsibilities of the churches are made explicit, and freedom is guaranteed for "a church to be a church, to determine its own life, and to appeal to a 'higher law' than the statutory enactments of the state."

This is a readable and admittedly "radical exposition" of the forces that threaten the separation of church and state in the United States. With stimulating incisiveness, and not without becoming controversial, Hudson endeavors to show "that encroachments of the state are due to the church's failure to maintain its necessary position in the partnership." This, of course, raises a burning ecclesiological issue.

Seen at its best and classic development prior to the Civil War, this great tradition of separation appears to Hudson as a "carefully defined equilibrium" in which the churches employed "an axiom of all Americans: the voluntary principle in religion." In vivid and rapid historical sequences the author depicts the rise, flowering, and, alas, the modern transmutation of this great tradition. The once vibrant and adventurous spirit of the Christian enterprise, according to Hudson, has given way to the temptation of accommodation to a secular environment. The essence of such secularization, he believes, is demonstrated in the drift of such movements as the YMCA, the institutional church, the Sunday school. These have left the moorings of a once potent and puritan Protestantism. In his analysis such princes of the American pulpit as Phillips Brooks and Russell Conwell share with other preachers and laymen the error of putting "instrinsic grace (virtue) in place of the grace of God in Christ." The result of this latter-day development is that "the church embraced the world." Hudson documents his charge that in this cultural accommodation the Protestant churches lost their unique and functional relationship to the state. Thus the once gratifying equilibrium of church and state has been seriously disturbed if not upset altogether.

For those who might wish to pursue this subject further, Hudson's study provides background and incentive for a reading of that ponderous contemporary classic by Anson Phelps Stokes, *Church and State in the United States*. It would also invite a careful examination of Philip Schaff's brilliant pioneer monograph which bears the same title as the work by Stokes. Indeed, Schaff's synoptic view of the European and the American scene made him conclude that the United States "furnishes the first example in history of a government deliberately depriving itself of all legislative control over religion." Older governments, said Schaff, had regarded such control as "the chief support of public morality, order, peace, and prosperity." Henceforth, as he put it, the distinctive character of organized Christianity in America, as compared to that in Europe, was this: A free church in a free state; or, self-governing and self-supporting denominations in independent but friendly relations to the civil government. To guarantee a *United* States, the founding fathers framed a constitution and formulated its first amendment in a way that guaranteed religious freedom on a national scale. It is this sharp insight of Schaff that Hudson seeks to invest with an almost impassioned concern. He deplores the "strange silence" of so many churches on the voluntary principle in religion. For he sees that "a day of reckoning has come for the churches."

Some major defects, however, weaken this otherwise fascinating and compelling analysis. One of these has to do with ecclesiology. Occasionally Hudson speaks of the church, but his basic premise is the recognition of ecclesiastical pluralism. Approvingly he cites Schaff: "To talk about any particular denomination as the church . . . has no meaning, and betrays ignorance and conceit. . . . The American laws know no such institution as 'the church' but only separate and independent organizations." Yet under such circumstances it may not be enough to use the vouchsafed freedom simply for "a church to be a church." The very plight of Protestantism is its admitted lack, particularly in America, of a fuller grasp and realization of the church as a whole.

A related defect appears to be the limited scope of this study. It treats of Calvinism,

modified by Methodism, and implemented with revivalism and the techniques of social strategy. But by some strange process, so it seems to me, the author's initial idealization of the earlier nineteenth century Protestantism keeps him preoccupied. Thus he has nothing to say about the Lutherans; nothing about the Roman Catholics. Certainly the latter, if not the former, have played a substantial part in modifying the "great tradition." Nor does the author seem to deal clearly enough with the strong tide of secularization set up by the public schools and a Deweyesque pragmatism which the bearers of the great tradition accepted with apparently uncritical faith.

While Dr. Hudson justifiably extols the great tradition, the means he advocates for a return to it are not altogether convincing. For he seems to omit some important ingredients of theological content which are basic to evangelical Christianity and essential to a follow-up of this excellent, if incomplete, analysis. The old days cannot return. New forces are in the seats of power. If America is to be rescued at all from its present spiritual vexations and confusions, a challenge must be sounded to Roman Catholics and Lutherans as well as to Protestants of the Anglo-Saxon tradition.

As professor of church history at Colgate-Rochester, Dr. Hudson has given us a pointed reminder of unfinished theological business. The churches prominent on the American scene need to be seen as a whole in relation to the moral and spiritual plight of a society which is desperately in need of remaining free, and whose freedom derives from the proper relation between man and God even more than from a highly prized separation of church and state and an ever so laudable voluntarism.

E. Theodore Bachmann

Reformation Writings of Martin Luther, Vol. II. Translated by Bertram Lee Woolf. New York: The Philosophical Library, 1956. 340 pages. $7.50.

This volume, which bears the sub-title "The Spirit of the Reformation," is the second one in a new translation of Luther's primary works now being published in England. Vol. I was published 1952. They contain the principal writings of Luther during the critical years of the Reformation, 1519-21, except the commentary on Galatians and with the regrettable omission of the treatise on "Good Works." A third volume seems to be in the offing.

The present volume contains two of Luther's most valuable devotional writings, The Fourteen Consolations and The Magnificat; three sermons preached just prior to Worms or on the journey, the most important sources for Luther's appearance at the Diet; also a well chosen selection of his prefaces to the biblical books, Luther's Preface to his German Mass, and a couple of others. The selection is designed to meet the needs of the British, especially to meet the needs of the "present religious decay and cynicism." The sermon on the Lord's Supper and the Introduction to the German Mass may have special application to the present state of American Lutheranism.

The introductions, general as well as those to the separate writings, are one of the most valuable features of the present translation. Together they give a fairly complete history of the Reformation in this period. They reveal a balanced, sober, and competent historian. Woolf is quite independent of traditional judgments and clichés. His presentation of Luther's character is one of the most sympathetic, appreciative, and understanding that has appeared from the pen of an Englishman.

The volumes are supplied with footnotes, valuable to the scholar, but not for the display of learning. They are unobtrusive, so as not to disturb the enjoyment of the book by the average reader. There is no attempt, either here or in the introductions, to make Luther a workhorse for this or that theological view.

Woolf has really succeeded in making Luther talk plain English, as he talked plain German to his Germans. This is more than can be said of most English translations that have appeared in the past. The language flows easily. It has no antiquarian flavor; and there is hardly any trace of translation English, which is difficult for a translator to avoid, for translation is a difficult art.

This translation will not and should not displace the use of the Philadelphia edition

of select works of Luther in English, which is more inclusive. Nor does it duplicate the new translation now in process of publication. But it deserves to be used also on this side of the Atlantic. It will serve to promote the reading of Luther. Incidentally, it is one of the several manifestations of a rising interest in Luther in England, and an important one.

IVER IVERSEN

A History of the Ecumenical Movement, 1517-1948. Edited by Ruth Rouse and Stephen Charles Neill. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1954. 822 pages. $9.

Since it was first published in 1954 this comprehensive history of the ecumenical movement has become an invaluable reference work and teaching tool. While at times it appears labored and pedestrian, it nevertheless gets around and achieves its intended purpose. Its wealth of information is not without flashes of inspiration that illumine wide areas of Christian concern, for it endeavors to recover a dimension of ecclesiastical inclusiveness and a sense of the wholeness of the church. How well it does this varies with the seventeen contributors to this symposium. And how far one can recover breadth and wholeness by emphasizing unity (in terms of historical fact) without giving commensurate emphasis to truth (in terms of theologically conformed faith) remains a crucial question. But this is certain, that in today's striving for an answer to "the nature of the unity we seek," a solid orientation in this ecumenical history is essential. To which a caveat must be added, in that this kind of historiography presupposes a knowledge of general church history. In a sense, then, this work is an ecumenical premium for those who already know something about the story of the church and of the churches; while at the same time it is an ecumenical corrective for the sins of denominational or secular omission in the theologian's as well as the historian's craft.

In contrast to a common practice of writing church history in terms of ecclesiastical divisions, the aim of this work was to set forth "the earnest unitive efforts by which almost every generation has been marked." Sponsored by the Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, near Geneva, and financially aided by the Disciples of Christ, this adventurous project was a *desideratum* even while the World Council of Churches was still "in process of formation." A guiding force behind its initial stages was the veteran Swiss theologian and well known international interpreter of the ecumenical movement, Adolph Keller. Two experienced World Council staffers were the editors: the late Ruth Rouse, onetime able leader in the World Student Christian Movement, and Stephen Charles Neill, former Anglican bishop of Tinnevelly, South India.

The contributors include six Anglicans, three Lutherans, two Calvinists, two Eastern Orthodox, one Methodist, and one Baptist. (The Lutherans are Professor Martin Schmidt, Berlin; Dean Nils Karlstrom, Skara, Sweden; and Dr. Nils Ehrenstrom, formerly Geneva, now Boston.) The three American contributors are Professor John T. McNeill, Union Seminary, New York; Professor Kenneth Scott Latourette, Yale; and Dr. Donald H. Yoder, formerly Franklin and Marshall College, now University of Pennsylvania.

Between Bishop Neill's introductory sketch of church unity from ancient times to the end of the Middle Ages, and his summarizing epilogue, the 16 chapters fall into two major parts. With the year 1910 (the Edinburgh conference on world missions) dividing the old from the new, seven chapters carry the story from the age of the Reformation through the nineteenth century, while nine chapters deal with the four ecumenically formative decades of the twentieth century. Such an allocation of space magnifies the claim that the ecumenical movement is "the great new fact" in contemporary church history.

E. THEODORE BACHMANN

Toward a Christian Philosophy of Higher Education. Edited by John Paul von Grueningen. Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1957. 191 pages. $3.50.

This is a collection of papers presented at a convocation held at Jamestown College, North Dakota, in 1955. There are eleven essays grouped in four parts: Theory, Personality, Method, and Goals.

There is much self-examination going on in American education. It is chiefly of two kinds. On the one hand, there is concern for providing the physical facilities, faculties, and course offerings needed to take care of the large increase in students now and in the future. On the other hand, there is the probing of the basic purposes, content, and method of the educational process. This book belongs to the latter. It seeks to find and state some fundamental principles involved in Christian liberal arts education.

The title is modest enough. It suggests that what is written here approaches a Christian philosophy of higher education. Most of those who have delved into this field come from their studies humbled and with at least as many questions as before. This study is not a final work, then, on an important subject. But it is a contribution to the conversation which must be continued if we are to understand what we are doing as a Christian church in education.

Some well known Lutherans (Bergendoff, O. P. Kretzmann, Hulme) together with such Protestants as Joseph Haroutunian, Merrimom Cunninggim, Ruth Eckert, and D. Elton Trueblood contribute to this volume. As with any collection of essays, these vary in quality and originality of presentation. Also, when several persons present papers on various aspects of the same general subject, each tends to deliver the prolegomena. This is the case here, too, and while this was no doubt unavoidable at the convocation, it would have been expected that in editing the papers for publication some of the duplication and generalization would have been eliminated.

The book starts in the right place. Dr. E. H. Rian, president of Jamestown College, writing the opening chapter on "The Need: A World View," concludes that "A world view for Protestants cannot be superimposed, but it can be firmly founded and built on the rock which is our common faith" (p. 22). The heart of this "common faith" is the "Lordship of Christ." Joseph Haroutunian, the able professor at McCormick Seminary, has one of the best chapters in the book. It is easy to read because it is interestingly written. His burden is that Christian liberal arts must always be "practical" in the sense that it is "experimentally" lived by teacher and student. Education which leads the student into maturity (by refusing to dominate him through indoctrination) is the only truly Christian and liberal education.

The chapter on "personality" by Bergendoff is excellent. The meaning of personality in terms of what is revealed concerning man through the incarnation is presented as the heart of what we are concerned with in Christian education.

O. P. Kretzmann writes in his customary delightful style, striking blows at the overemphasis on intercollegiate athletics and administration in American education. As a college president he no doubt has a right to classify these two culprits together! The essential danger of getting lost in the administration of the college instead of the teaching program is a real one, and Kretzmann knows it.

A worthy successor to this study would be one which would deal with the curriculum of the Christian college. This book skirts that issue; it deals with the basis, background, organization, and general characteristics of Christian higher education but does not come to grips with the heart of the education problem, that which is taught in the classroom. Dr. Cunninggim's chapter on curriculum is a general statement in this area, and discussion at the convocation no doubt involved the application of his ideas to specific areas of study. But more needs to be said on the whole matter of which courses contribute to a liberal arts education and why, as well as the difficult problem of how these courses are to be taught in a Christian college.

To the studies by Moberly, Ferre, Brown, and others, this is a welcome addition. It is of the nature of education that it needs constantly to be re-examined and re-adapted to the needs of society. There are basic truths concerning man and God and life which remain unchanged. But we have not fully understood them in terms of academic life and disciplines. The Jamestown convocation moved in that direction. May there be many more such conferences and resulting studies.

SIDNEY A. RAND

An Approach to Christian Education. Edited by Rupert E. Davies. New York: Philosophical Library, 1956. 159 pages. $4.75.

One may have hoped for that greatly needed volume on *A Philosophy of Christian Education.* Instead one finds a symposium of eleven chapters by nine British teachers in what we would call "the English private school." Their question is how to accomplish, through the various departments in that type of school, the kind of education that can be called Christian. We might put it: How shall all types of classroom be made effective for Christian development?

A first chapter by the editor comes closest to our hoped-for topic but, notice, its title is "A Christian Philosophy of Education." The author describes five inadequate approaches; then he explores one which seems to be represented in subsequent chapters (especially on history, literature, languages, mathematics and sciences).

The recommended approach includes a way in which all other subjects are to be taught. Then there will be also a subject called "divinity" and there will be worship. The intent throughout is to develop a whole man, matured in each part, with the entirety synthesized around the center of allegiance to God in Jesus Christ.

While divinity is to have a special place, the other subjects are to serve also, so that the pupil will see truth as one and the world as one. While the teacher and pupil are dealing with the normal substance of any subject, they will observe the inter-relation of that phase with the whole and especially its significance in terms of the center of existence. The authors would hold, for instance, that mathematics may be taught (mathematics, not Christian mathematics) so that the youth may become a mathematician and also a more complete man in Christ. Procedures are to be chosen as far as possible for that major objective. Teacher-pupil relationships are recognized as the most significant of all influences.

The place of "divinity" is described in this sentence: "Thus divinity stands in the general curriculum of the school as the co-ordinator of the whole." And there, once again, our British friends seem to reveal that they have not truly seen that Christian education, in process as well as product, is concerned with understandings *and* attitudes *and* "patterns of action." Rather they continue to limit their approach largely to the intellectual phases of total personality. This is still too much the limited education of "inert idea" and the static religion of propositional acceptance.

Yet a clue to the whole problem may be revealed in this statement by the editor: "It is plain that Christian education, depending as it does on Christian teachers, is a thing of the future, not of the present." Perhaps this says to us that the Americans as well as the British will bring up youth to be Christian men and women only when we provide for them to interact with a Christian community of elders in home, church, school, and elsewhere who are more mature in the faith. Maybe our most urgent Christian educational task is in the area of adulthood (including the teaching profession).

RALPH D. HEIM

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY

Published quarterly by the Editorial Council of Lutheran Theological Seminaries and continuing *The Lutheran Quarterly,* founded in Gettysburg as *The Evangelical Review* in 1849, *The Lutheran Church Review,* founded in Philadelphia in 1882, *The Lutheran Church Quarterly,* Philadelphia and Gettysburg since 1928, and *The Augustana Quarterly,* Rock Island, Illinois, since 1922.

Editor

THEODORE G. TAPPERT
7333 Germantown Ave., Philadelphia 19, Pennsylvania

Managing Editor

A. J. ENGELBRECHT
1250 Nowata St., Dubuque, Iowa

Book Editor

WARREN A. QUANBECK
2245 Luther Place, St. Paul 8, Minnesota

Circulation Manager

PAUL M. LINDBERG
Augustana Theological Seminary, Rock Island, Illinois

EDITORIAL COUNCIL

Representatives of

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Gettysburg, Pa.

Lutheran Theological Seminary
Philadelphia, Pa.

Augustana Theological Seminary
Rock Island, Ill.

Capital University Theological Seminary
Columbus, Ohio

Wartburg Theological Seminary
Dubuque, Iowa

Luther Theological Seminary
St. Paul, Minn.

Augsburg Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Central Seminary
Fremont, Neb.

Chicago Lutheran Seminary
Maywood, Ill.

Evangelical Lutheran Seminary of Canada
Waterloo, Ont.

Grandview Seminary
Des Moines, Iowa

Hamma Divinity School
Springfield, Ohio

Lutheran Seminary
Saskatoon, Sask.

Northwest Lutheran Seminary
Minneapolis, Minn.

Southern Lutheran Seminary
Columbia, S. C.

Suomi Seminary
Hancock, Mich.

Trinity Seminary
Blair, Neb.

Pacific Lutheran Seminary
Berkeley, Calif.

VOLUME IX

1957

Times and News Publishing Co.

Index to Volume IX

I. AUTHORS AND SUBJECTS

AHLEN, A. C. M.
Review of: Miegge, *The Virgin Mary* ... 372
AHLSTROM, SYDNEY E.
The Lutheran Church and American Culture ... 321
ALLBECK, WILLARD D.
The Living Church ... 99
Reviews of: Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter* ... 84
Spinka, *The Church in Soviet Russia* ... 180
BACHMANN, E. THEODORE
Reviews of: Spinka, ed., *Advocates of Reform, Wyclif to Erasmus* ... 373
Hudson, *The Great Tradition of the American Churches* ... 373
Rouse & Neill, eds., *History of the Ecumenical Movement* ... 376
BAKKEN, NORMAN K.
Avenues of Thought in Mark's Gospel ... 222
BAUGHMAN, HARRY F.
Reviews of: Brunner, *The Great Invitation and Other Sermons* ... 86
Stevenson, *Preaching on the Books of the New Testament* ... 184
BELGUM, DAVID
Review of: Boison, *Religion in Crisis and Culture* ... 84
BREAM, HOWARD N.
On a Preposition in the Nicene Creed ... 250
BREMER, OTTO A.
Reviews of: Hedley, *Religion on the Campus* ... 91
Poteat, *Jesus' Belief in Man* ... 368
BURTNESS, JAMES H.
Review of: Metzger, *St. Paul's Journeys in the Greek Orient* ... 69
BUSCHMANN, WALTER
Christianity and Culture ... 260
CARNARIUS, STAN
The Dead Wood in Theological Diction ... 50
CONRAD, F. LESLIE, JR.
Preaching to Young People ... 144
CREAGER, HAROLD L.
Review of: Williams, *The Prophets, Pioneers to Christianity* ... 74
DITMANSON, HAROLD H.
Reviews of: Baillie, *The Idea of Revelation in Recent Thought* ... 79
Hazelton, *God's Way with Man* ... 370
Murray, *Natural Religion and Christian Theology* ... 371
DOCKEN, L. DONALD
Review of: Taylor, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus* ... 66
ERLANDSON, E. J.
Review of: Read, *The Christian Faith* ... 190
FAILLETTAZ, VERNON P.
Review of: *The Interpreter's Bible*. Vol. XI ... 183
FEVOLD, EUGENE L.
Reviews of: Telfer, ed., *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa* ... 173
Lake, *The Story of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.* ... 181
FISCHER, ROBERT H.
Reviews of: Saarnivaara, *Luther Discovers the Gospel* ... 94
Ferm, ed., *Puritan Sage: Writings of Jonathan Edwards* ... 176
FLACK, E. E.
Reviews of: Sevenster et al., eds., *Studia Paulina* ... 68
Kraeling, *Rand McNally Bible Atlas* ... 182
Lowe, *Saint Peter* ... 189
GREEN, LOWELL C.
Toward an Evangelical Understanding of the Lutheran Confessions ... 234

GRIMSTVEDT, CLYDE J.
Reviews of: Rein, *Adventures in Christian Stewardship* ... 88
Kantonen, *A Theology of Christian Stewardship* ... 284
HAAS, HAROLD
Sociological Implications for Christian Education ... 3
HALVORSON, JOHN V.
Reviews of: Parrot, *Nineveh and the Old Testament* ... 69
Robinson, *The Cross in the Old Testament* ... 74
Bewer, *The Prophets* ... 188
HANSON, JAMES H.
Reviews of: Loew, *Modern Rivals to Christian Faith* ... 89
Brown, *The Significance of the Church* ... 89
HEIKKINEN, JACOB
New Study of Luther in Finland ... 361
Reviews of: Schlatter, *The Church in the New Testament* ... 64
Sparks, *The Formation of the New Testament* ... 68
HEIM, RALPH D.
Review of: Davies, ed., *An Approach to Christian Education* ... 378
HEIMARCK, THEODORE
Review of: Wynn, ed., *Sermons on Marriage and Family Life* ... 87
Wedel, *The Pulpit Rediscovers Theology* ... 190
HEINECKEN, MARTIN J.
Reviews of: Berdyaev, *Truth and Revelation* ... 80
Burnaby, *Christian Words and Christian Meanings* ... 93
Cochrane, *The Existentialist and God* ... 94
HERTZ, KARL H.
Reviews of: Carlson, *The Church and the Public Conscience* ... 82
Esbjornson, *The Christian in Politics: Luther Youngdahl* ... 83
HOFFMAN, G. H.
Reflections on Divorce and Remarriage ... 125
HOLMER, PAUL L.
Christianity and the Truth ... 33
Reviews of: Dillistone, *Christianity and Symbolism* ... 77
Collins, *A History of Modern European Philosophy* ... 92
HULME, WILLIAM E.
How Effective Is Our Public Worship? ... 350
IVERSEN, IVER
Review of: Woolf, tr., *Reformation Writings of Martin Luther* ... 375
JENSON, ROBERT W.
Review of: Snaith, *The Jews from Cyrus to Herod* ... 191
JOHNSON, HJALMAR W.
Reviews of: Soper, *The Religions of Mankind* ... 86
Jurji, *The Christian Interpretation of Religion* ... 181
KEGLEY, CHARLES W.
Reviews of: Brown, *Subject and Object in Modern Theology* ... 78
Berdyaev, *The Meaning of the Creative Act* ... 179
KNUDSEN, JOHANNES
Bishops and Church Administration in Denmark ... 266
KORTE, BERTHOLD F.
Early Lutheran Relations with the Eastern Orthodox ... 53
LARSEN, HERMAN A.
Review of: Shaw, *Pulpit under the Sky* ... 81
LARSON, LOWELL O.
Review of: Jeffrey, ed., *The Sacramental Table. Addresses* ... 88
LEO, PAUL
Review of: Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* ... 63
LIEFELD, THEODORE S.
Review of: Tenney, *The New Testament: A Survey* ... 186
MARSHALL, ROBERT J.
Review of: Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* ... 276
MENGERS, ETHAN
Reviews of: Kraeling, *The Old Testament since the Reformation* ... 73
Köhler, *Hebrew Man: How he Looked, Lived, and Thought* ... 365
MILLER, L. DAVID
What Makes Good Hymns? ... 154

MILTON, J. P.
Reviews of: Vos, *The Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews* 189
Würthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament* 365
MOLVIK, MAURICE S.
Reviews of: Jones, *Mastery* 192
Cushman, *The Prayers of Jesus* 284
MUEDEKING, GEORGE H.
Review of: Hulme, *Counseling and Theology* 287
MUMM, HARRY J.
Review of: Stauffer, *Christ and the Caesars* 70
MYERS, JACOB M.
Reviews of: Laetsch, *Bible Commentary: the Minor Prophets* 72
Bright, *Early Israel in Recent History Writing* 277
Ringgren, *The Messiah in the Old Testament* 278
Wright, *Biblical Archaeology* 363
NARUM, WILLIAM H. K.
Reviews of: Hill, *Ethics in Theory and Practice* 182
Toynbee, *An Historian's Approach to History* 284
NELSON, E. CLIFFORD
Review of: Niebuhr, *The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry* 286
NELSON, OLOF H.
Rebuttal on the Lord's Supper 60
PREUS, HERMAN A.
The Merger and the Confessions 358
RAND, SIDNEY A.
Reviews of: Verduin & Wenger, eds., *Writings of Menno Simons* 174
Pelikan, ed., *Luther's Works,* Vol. XXI 280
Raven, *Christ and the Modern Opportunity* 367
Grueningen, ed., *Toward a Christian Philosophy of Education* 376
REUMANN, JOHN
Reviews of: Davies et al., *Twentieth Century Bible Commentary* 75
Rowlingson, *Introduction to New Testament Study* 187
Filson, *Jesus Christ the Risen Lord* 366
RILLING, JOHN W.
Review of: Tappert, *Luther's Letters of Spiritual Counsel* 173
RITCHIE, M. A. F.
The Churches and Community Relations 110
RUETER, A. C.
Reviews of: Acker, ed., *Wedding Addresses* 87
Beck, *Why I Am a Lutheran* 185
Austin, *Come As You Are* 186
Wentz, *The Times Test the Church* 283
SCHEIDT, DAVID L.
The High Church Movement in American Lutheranism 343
SCHMIDT, JOHN
World Lutheranism and Evangelization 213
SCHOTT, GEORGE F.
Reviews of: Hendry, *The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology* 76
Shaw, *Christian Doctrine* 191
SCHREIBER, OTTO L.
Collections of Luther Medals in America 42
STAMM, RAYMOND T.
Faith and Medicine at Work 291
Review of: Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History* 66
STENSVAAG, JOHN M.
Recent Approaches to the Psalms 195
Review of: Young, *Studies in Isaiah* 364
STIREWALT, M. L., JR.
Observations on the Church and Segregation 254
TAPPERT, EDWIN C.
Desert Wisdom: The Sayings of the Anchorites 157
TAPPERT, THEODORE G.
Reviews of: Sehling, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen* 85
Mosse, *A Theological German Vocabulary* 284
THOMTE, REIDAR
Reviews of: Jor, *Sören Kierkegaard* 176
Croxall, *Kierkegaard Commentary* 281

Traver, Amos J.
Review of: Jones, *Principles and Practice of Preaching* 86
Wahlstrom, Eric H.
The Beginning of Jesus' Ministry in Luke 151
Reviews of: Barnekow et al., *Bibel, Bekännelse, Ämbete* 70
Clark, *An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments* 279
Wentz, Abdel Ross
Review of: McLoughlin, *Billy Sunday Was his Real Name* 89
Wolf, Herbert
The Responsibility of the Church in Higher Education 17
Wrigley, Victor K.
Heresy and Christianity: a Reply to Prof. Roth 270

II. BOOKS REVIEWED

Acker, ed., *Wedding Addresses* 87
Austin, *Come As You Are* 186
Baillie, *The Idea of Revelation in Recent Thought* 79
Barnekow et al., *Bibel, Bekännelse, Ämbete* 70
Beck, *Why I Am a Lutheran* 185
Berdyaev, *The Meaning of the Creative Act* 179
———, *Truth and Revelation* 80
Bewer, *The Prophets* 188
Boison, *Religion in Crisis and Culture* 84
Bright, *Early Israel in Recent History Writing* 277
Brown, James, *Subject and Object in Modern Theology* 78
———, Robert, *The Significance of the Church* 89
Brunner, *The Great Invitation and Other Sermons* 86
Bryant, *Climbing the Heights. Daily Devotions* 186
Burnaby, *Christian Words and Christian Meanings* 93
Cadbury, *The Book of Acts in History* 66
Carlson, *The Church and the Public Conscience* 82
Clark, *An Approach to the Theology of the Sacraments* 279
Cochrane, *The Existentialist and God* 94
Collins, *A History of Modern European Philosophy* 92
Croxall, *Kierkegaard Commentary* 281
Cushman, *The Prayers of Jesus* 284
Davies, G. Henton, et al., *The Twentieth Century Bible Commentary* 75
———, Rupert E., *An Approach to Christian Education* 378
Dillistone, *Christianity and Symbolism* 77
Esbjornson, *A Christian in Politics: Luther Youngdahl* 83
Ferm, ed., *Puritan Sage: Writings of Jonathan Edwards* 176
Filson, *Jesus Christ the Risen Lord* 366
Grueningen, ed., *Toward a Christian Philosophy of Education* 376
Hazelton, *God's Way with Man* 370
Interpeter's Bible, The. Vol. XI 183
Hedley, *Religion on the Campus* 91
Hendry, *The Holy Spirit in Christian Theology* 76
Hill, *Ethics in Theory and Practice* 182
Hudson, *The Great Tradition of the American Churches* 373
Hulme, *Counseling and Theology* 287
Jeffrey, ed., *The Sacramental Table* 88
Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* 63
Jones, E. Stanley, *Mastery* 192
———, Ilion T., *Principles and Practice of Preaching* 86
Jor, *Søren Kierkegaard* 176
Jurji, *The Christian Interpretation of Religion* 181
Kantonen, *A Theology for Christian Stewardship* 284
Köhler, *Hebrew Man: How he Looked, Lived, and Thought* 365
Kraeling, *Rand McNally Bible Atlas* 182
Laetsch, *Bible Commentary: the Minor Prophets* 72
Lake, *Story of the Presbyterian Church, U. S. A.* 181
Loew, *Modern Rivals to Christian Faith* 89
Lowe, *Saint Peter* 189
McLoughlin, *Billy Sunday Was his Real Name* 89

Metzger, *St. Paul's Journeys in the Greek Orient* 69
Miegge, *The Virgin Mary* 372
Mosse, *A Theological German Vocabulary* 284
Mowinckel, *He That Cometh* 276
Murray, *Natural Religion and Christian Theology* 371
Niebuhr, *The Purpose of the Church and its Ministry* 286
Owen, *Body and Soul* 368
Parrot, *Nineveh and the Old Testament* 69
Pelikan, ed., *Luther's Works,* Vol. XXI 280
Poteat, *Jesus' Belief in Man* 368
Raven, *Christ and the Modern Opportunity* 367
Read, *The Christian Faith* 190
Rein, *Adventures in Christian Stewardship* 88
Ringgren, *The Messiah in the Old Testament* 278
Robinson, *The Cross in the Old Testament* 174
Rouse & Neill, eds., *A History of the Ecumenical Movement* 376
Rowlingson, *Introduction to New Testament Study* 187
Saarnivaara, *Luther Discovers the Gospel* 94
Schlatter, *The Church in the New Testament Period* 64
Sehling, *Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen,* Vol. VI 85
Shaw, John M., *Christian Doctrine* 191
———, Joseph M., *Pulpit under the Sky* 81
Snaith, *The Jews from Cyrus to Herod* 191
Soper, *The Religions of Mankind* 86
Sparks, *The Formation of the New Testament* 68
Spinka, *The Church in Soviet Russia* 180
———, ed., *Advocates of Reform from Wyclif to Erasmus* 373
Stauffer, *Christ and the Caesars* 70
Stevenson, *Preaching on the Books of the New Testament* 184
Sykes, *Old Priest and New Presbyter* 85
Tappert, ed., *Luther's Letters of Spiritual Counsel* 173
Taylor, *The Life and Ministry of Jesus* 66
Tenney, *The New Testament: a Survey* 186
Telfer, ed., *Cyril of Jerusalem and Nemesius of Emesa* 173
Toynbee, *An Historian's Approach to Religion* 284
Verduin et al., eds., *Complete Writings of Menno Simons* 97
Vos, *The Teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews* 189
Wedel, *The Pulpit Rediscovers Theology* 190
Wentz, *The Times Test the Church* 283
Williams, *The Prophets, Pioneers to Christianity* 74
Woolf, tr., *Reformation Writings of Martin Luther,* II 375
Wright, Biblical Archaeology 363
Wuerthwein, *The Text of the Old Testament* 365
Wynn, ed., *Sermons on Marriage and Family Life* 87
Young, *Studies in Isaiah* 364

III. LIFE AND THOUGHT IN WORLD LUTHERANISM

Denmark: Bishops and Church Administration 266
Finland: New Study of Luther 361